Vol. 34 No. 7

BULLETIN

OF THE

TORREY BOTANICAL CLUB

JULY, 1907

# The stem of Ibervillea Sonorae*

ALICE ADELAIDE KNOX

(WITH PLATE 24)

Among the representatives of the *Cucurbitaceae* at the New York Botanical Garden is a group of plants of *Ibervillea Sonorae*. They were brought from the southwest by Dr. D. T. MacDougal in 1902, and are interesting because of their unusual character for cucurbits as well as for their adaptation to desert conditions. A description of the plants is given by Miss J. T. Emerson collaborating with Mr. W. W. Welker in a paper, in coarse of preparation, on its chemistry and pharmacology (34). FIGURES A and B show the organographic characters of the species, both at the adult stage in its native habitat, and as a seedling from four to five years old. The "large projecting root" (21) of *Ibervillea* in the specimens in the greenhouses of the Botanical Garden reaches a diameter of from 25 to 30 cm. In the desert this enormous tuberous growth lying in the dry sand looks like a gray, dust-covered boulder. Frequently irregularities of shape give it still more the effect of stone, and it is only when the cortex is flecked off that one discovers the healthy green color beneath the superficial layer. From the tubers arise yearly long flexible liana-like shoots which reach a length of three or more meters. The shoots are round, smooth and green above, brown-gray and gray-spotted or streaked below. The flowers are dioecious, the tendrils branched, and the leaves bright-green and twice three-cleft as is so frequently the case throughout the family. The fruit is said to

*A research pursued in the laboratories of Barnard College during the winter of 1904–1 05.

[The BULLETIN for June, 1907 (34: 271–328, *pl. 22, 23*) was issued 26 Jl 1907.]

be "amber-colored" (21) and one and a quarter to one and a half inches long; none has ripened in the greenhouse, as the flowers there are staminate only. The plant is able to persist in its arid habitat with remarkable vitality. In fact, so provident is it of water and nutritive substances that one in the museum case at the Garden which has been lying on a board since 1902 is in 1907 still sending up yearly shoots bearing leaves and tendrils. Every fall the shoots die back and sprout again early the next spring. The Indians of the desert call the plant "Guarequi," and a decoction of its root is much used as a cathartic.

The forms which show perennial growth among the *Cucurbitaceae* are comparatively few in number, and many of them are tropical species or types seldom seen. Of those which have tuberous stems or roots the most familiar are *Thladiantha* and *Bryonia*. The large slices of the *Bryonia* root are well known in pharmacy, and Weiss (10) refers to a root 20 cm. in diameter and 10 kg. in weight. More work has been done on *Bryonia* than on any other perennial form. It was pictured by Jacquin in 1774 as an example of perennial growth, and reference is made to it in most of the papers mentioned below.

The history of *Ibervillea* is given in full by Miss Emerson, so that only the most important citations are noted here. The first species of the genus was described by Gray (1) in 1850, from Texas and Mexico, as *Sicydium Lindheimeri*. In 1881 Cogniaux (11) separated from *Sicydium* the genus *Maximowiczia* Cogn., with three species. The first description of *Maximowiczia Sonorae* was published by Sereno Watson (21) in 1889. It was one of the numbers of the collection of Dr. E. Palmer found in 1887 about Guaymas, Mexico. Not only the range of *M. Sonorae* but that of the entire genus is purely American. As the name *Maximowiczia* had been previously used for another genus, the name *Ibervillea* was given to the present one by Greene (27) in 1895, and the species here discussed named by him as *Ibervillea Sonorae*. The only anatomical study of the genus has been made by Fischer (17), who included it in his thorough general survey of the family. It will be of advantage first to describe the normal structure of the Cucurbitaceous stem. The terminology used is that of Haberlandt (32).

The stems of cucurbits are usually five-angled, and only in exceptional cases seven-angled or terete. A transverse section through a stem of this type, or five-angled stem, exhibits two circles of bundles, five in each circle, the outer standing in the angles, the inner in the furrows. The bundles are normally all bicollateral, possessing an outer leptome, a hadrome region, and an inner leptome. Both inner and outer leptome contain very large and prominent sieve-tubes, as well as much leptome parenchyma. The common opinion seems to be that there is no inner cambium, though the outer cambium is a wide and active zone peripheral to each hadrome strand. The bundles are widely separated, and lie in a large-celled ground parenchyma. The pitted vessels of the hadrome are exceptionally large, and in older stems are braced by thyllae. A continuous ring of stereome borders the outer limit of the pericycle, and there is a row of starch-filled cells, accompanied by various arrangements of chlorophyl-free collenchyma just beneath the epidermis. There are frequently hairs or glands on the epidermis, and sieve-tubes scattered through the cortex and pericycle. Inner secretory passages are wanting, and deposits of calcium carbonate seem to occur only in the leaves. As the stems are mostly annual a periderm does not form, and for the same reason no true bark is found. Many species show a lysigenous cavity in the pith making the stem hollow, and because its secondary growth chokes this cavity and fills it up *Bryonia dioica* is mentioned as peculiar.

In describing *Ibervillea* it will be taken first as a primary stem at the end of the first year, and later as a secondary stem, and a diagram of the transverse section of the young shoot cut 24 cm. from its tip where the stem was fresh and green is given in PLATE 24, FIGURE 1. This shows the general outline of the section to be irregular with a possible tendency toward the seven-angled type, though its external appearance is smooth, the number of the blunt "angles" varies, and as it grows older it is always terete. The bundles are arranged in two rings, those of the outer being smaller. The number of those in the inner ring is always five, that of the outer ring varies from five to seven or even nine. An attempt is at once suggested to place the stem in one of the classes made by Lotar (12), Petersen (14), or Tondera (31). Different

numbers of bundles are given by these authors for the same form, but in *Iberville*a, as Weiss (15) found to be the case, the number may vary not only in the same species and the same plant, but even in the same internode. In a well-developed branching stem with a length of 310.6 cm. there were at the base ten bundles, at the first fork twelve bundles in each branch, thirteen in the main branch above, and in its side shoots most frequently twelve, but sometimes thirteen or fourteen. Lotar (12), too, says that differences may occur, due to the temporary splitting of individual bundles.

In the single growing tip which my material afforded there were eleven procambial strands, so that the number is not derived from a primitive procambial ten, but doubtless varies in the separation of the young meristems. The structure of the bundle is altogether normal. The well-formed hadrome, which is cut off centrifugally by the cambium which lies along its outer surface, shows the usual succession of ring, spiral, and pitted ducts, and the last are very large, and always surrounded by wood-parenchyma. The outer leptome contains large sieve-tubes with prominent sieve-plates and companion-cells; there is also much leptome-parenchyma and the outer and inner leptome are alike in their constituent elements. The outer cambium region consists of several rows of brick-shaped cells, while the inner or medullary cambium (FIGURE 10) shows cells more polygonal in outline, and is more localized in its later divisions.

The ground-tissue in *Iberville*a is always solid, consisting of large parenchyma-cells of which the walls are more and more conspicuously pitted as the stems grow older. The cells are ordinarily full of starch which occurs in large grains crowded together so densely that the tissues of the bundles stand out in sharp contrast. Several rows of large cells intervene between the bundles and the stereome-ring. The latter (FIGURE 2, *st*) is from two to three cells wide and consists of lignified fibrous cells marked with cross-shaped pits. It breaks up as soon as the stem begins to enlarge, and the dilatation-changes progressively fill up the interstices. Without the stereome-ring is found a row of starch-containing cells (FIGURE 2, *end*) with the radial walls at right angles to the tangential, and slightly more oblong in cross-section than the adjacent parenchyma-cells, which Van Tieghem (13) cites as the

endodermis. Outside of the endodermis there are two layers of chlorenchyma with autochthonous starch (FIGURE 2, *ch*), and then two layers of angle-collenchyma (*col*), chlorophyl-free, bordered by a large-celled epidermis. There are occasionally stomata, but they show no special adaptations to desert conditions, nor is the cutin-layer unusually thick.

There remains to be mentioned a system which has been admirably treated by Fischer (17), namely the sieve-tubes which are found scattered singly or in groups throughout the pericycle and the cortex. The discovery of supernumerary sieve-tubes just inside the stereome-ring was made by Sanio (4) in 1864 in *Cucumis sativus*. DeBary (6) found them in the same position in a number of other species, but Fischer added two new categories to those of Sanio and de Bary. To the study of their development and physiology he devotes 109 pages. He finds sieve-tubes with companion-cells and "nebencellen" without as well as within the stereome-ring. There are also horizontal series which he designates *commissural* sieve-tubes and sieve-bundles which connect with the leptome of the bundles and with each other. These sieve-tubes are to be seen only in the very young tips, for they function during the period of elongation, and owing to the pressure of the growing tissues about them soon lose their typical structure. Fischer describes their progressive phases of development according to Sachs' phases of growth, and treats especially of the meristematic period of elongation. The first sieve-tubes to appear in the stem, which function before any of the others, lie on the edge of the outer procambial strands between the more typical phloem region and the mother-tissue of the stereome-ring. At this stage the procambial strand borders closely on this mother-tissue, but later by the development of parenchyma they become more isolated from the bundle and stand out in the pericycle. In *Ibervillea* they are very prominent, with large conspicuous sieve-plates.

Following these there appear first the sieve-tubes of the outer leptome, and with them the subepidermal ectocyclic sieve-cells and the ectocyclic cells which are found among the collenchyma. The inner leptome comes next in order, and just before the end of the meristematic elongation the endocyclic sieve-tubes mature. The commissural strands may originate with, but never before, the

endocyclic groups. All of these small sieve-bundles without the leptome and such commissural sieve-tubes as serve to connect them with each other are transitory in their activity, and by the end of the elongation-period are obliterated. The obliteration follows the reverse of the order in which they appeared, so that the endocyclic succeed the ectocyclic, and the commissures are the last to lose their identity. Fischer holds that the first sieve-tubes help to distribute the proteid substances to the young tissues of the stereome. Late they are reinforced in their office by the endocyclic sieve-tubes. They develop from the procambial strand, while the endocyclic sieve-tubes are derived partly from the mother-tissue of the stereome and partly from the ground-parenchyma. Ectocyclic sieve-tubes come from the mother-cells of the collenchyma and stereome, and at first support the young collenchyma, which grows rapidly in the early stages. When it has thickened and reached its maturity the outer ectocyclic cells are obliterated. The remaining ectocyclic tubes in the chlorenchyma and all commissural cells come from the secondary meristems derived from the parenchyma-cells of the pericycle and cortex.

The endocyclic sieve-tubes, as indicated above, nourish the developing stereome-ring and when its permanent character is determined they are obliterated. The commissures are obliterated last of all, and the order of their degeneration is one of the strong reasons why Fischer concludes that they serve to withdraw the proteid substance from the endocyclic sieve-tubes and from each other into the leptome of the bundles. The office of the sieve-tubes of the bundles and the course of their obliteration needs no special comment; the development of the procambial strand and the support of the growing cambium is dependent upon their activity. The sieve-tubes outside of the stereome-ring are connected with those inside only at the nodes, so that the endodermis and the mechanical tissue are never broken by the commissures.

The genera of the *Cucurbitaceae* are divided into classes upon the character of the supernumerary bundles, of which *Maximowiczia* (*Ibervillea*) belongs to the *Cyclanthera* type. There are said to be present countless endocyclic sieve-tubes (FIGURE 4) united partly with each other and partly with the vascular bundle by *very few* commissures. The *Ibervillea* at the Garden also possesses

(FIGURE 3) many ectocyclic sieve-tubes, but in only one or two instances has a young commissure appeared. In these cases the length of the members of the sieve-tube was that of the diameter of the mother parenchyma-cell, the two separated by a large, well-formed vertical sieve-plate. The peripheral sieve-tubes are easily seen in the very young stem (FIGURES 3 and 4) while the first tracheal elements are appearing and the sieve-plates are exceedingly delicate and distinct.

The obliteration of the sieve-tubes Fischer treats separately. They sometimes entirely lose their identity, owing to the pressure of the surrounding tissues and the torsions of the stem, but sometimes when the callose breaks down and the contents begin to degenerate, there appears in them a slimy substance giving to the older stem an appearance which leads him to say: "One may see that we have here another category of cell-derivatives, that our commissures and ectocyclic sieve-tubes belong to a hitherto overlooked latex-system," and again he says that the presence of these ramifying cells in the stem produces the effect of an internal secretory system. He takes up this point at length in a later paper (20) and refers to Hanstein's theory of the contents of the obliterated sieve-tubes as "Lebensaftgefässe," where Hanstein assumed that the contents were active while they were in reality hard and gum-like. A section through a stem of *Ibervillea* after its period of elongation is completed (FIGURES 9 and 2) shows inside of the medullary leptome, peripheral to the outer leptome, and through the pericycle and cortex, groups of cells both in structure and position identical with the obliterated sieve-elements. They contain a highly refrangible homogeneous substance of a brownish-yellow color which makes them very conspicuous. They occur ordinarily in pairs, frequently in groups of from three to twelve (FIGURES 5 and 6). The contents color orange with hydrochloric acid and phloroglucin, while the contents of the active sieve-tubes remain lemon-yellow. With Millon's reagent they turn brick-red.

Longitudinal sections frequently show the old sieve-plates, and the companion-cells seem to have contents identical with those of the sieve-tubes. The groups of cells are rarely seen to anastomose in young stems, but they frequently run a tangential or radial course, and may connect within a short distance in this manner. In older

stems, especially where they widen toward the tuber, they form an elaborate ramifying system throughout the periphery and the pith, as well as in connection with the supernumerary bundles which then develop (FIGURES 5 and 8). When such stems, perhaps two and a half centimeters in diameter, are cut, the contents of these passages ooze out, forming a large viscid transparent drop which covers the wound and which immediately hardens, forming a variety of wound-gum. When the sieve-tubes retain their content so generally, and when the contents are so evidently secretory in nature, one seems to be justified in calling them a secretory system of the secondary stem, and might take exception to Solereder (28) for saying generally for the entire family "Innere Sekretbehälter fehlen."

The secondary growth in the sense of the growth of a second year is illustrated in FIGURE 9. Its most prominent features are the increase in the size of the bundles and in the amount of leptome and hadrome, the great width of the medullary rays, the breaking of the stereome-ring, and the presence of a prominent periderm entirely surrounding the terete stem. One is also struck by the absence of any appearance of distortion due to the compression of the tissues, as this is true only in the horny regions of the leptome. The increase in the size of the bundles has been effected by the constant activity of both inner and outer cambium.

The amount of leptome produced is enormous. The outer cambium gives rise to all the hadrome elements, vessels, and wood-parenchyma, and by its centrifugal divisions also generates the outer leptome. It consists of a succession of brick-shaped cells which spread across the entire tangential surface of the hadrome. Peripheral to this is the mass of the outer leptome which contains parenchyma and many large conspicuous sieve-plates in the sieve-tubes. The inner leptome is similar to the outer in character, but the cambium is less regularly distributed. It is represented by a group of meristematic cells just within the inner tangential surface of the hadrome (FIGURE 11 $c_2$). These cells are polygonal in outline and are confined to the middle of the surface. The lines of cells $x$ and $y$ can be traced back to this origin. In many bundles a second series of divisions is local-

ized so as to make a distinct line across the outer surface of the leptome (as in FIGURE 11) with the appearance of a normal cambium. The line does not always show distinctly and is more apt to occur in large bundles.

These conclusions concerning an inner cambium do not agree with those of Bertrand (9), Lotar (12), and Schenck (26), who found hadrome formed by the inner cambium, nor with those of Fischer (17), who remarks the absence of an active inner cambium, saying that for a while the still procambial cells have the appearance of one. It is rather the state of things noted by Vesque (5), who claims as a false cambium one which produces only leptome; and afterward found by Scott and Brebner (25) in *Thladiantha*. The latter authors state that when a cambium is present it produces leptome only.

Around the oldest tangential borders of the leptome-regions are found the horny walls of the disorganized (obliterated) sieve-elements as well as masses of cells filled with yellow-brown gum whose localization is illustrated in FIGURE 9. The breaks in the stereome-ring are filled up with parenchyma, and dilatation-changes also occur in the medullary rays and the pericycle by which they keep pace with the increase in the size of the stem.

It occasionally happens, as Hérail (19) found to be the case in *Ecballium*, that the tangential divisions of the parenchyma may be so localized between two bundles as to give the appearance of an interfascicular cambium. Potter (22) found an interesting interfascicular cambium in *Thladiantha* which connected bundles of the inner and outer circles, showing as de Bary had said that the two concentric rows function as a single ring. New medullary rays are not formed yearly. In large old stems two or perhaps three may occur (FIGURE 13), but this is in very old plants, and they develop only at long intervals. The periderm is superficial in origin. It arises from the layer of the collenchyma just beneath the epidermis. It soon becomes spotted or streaked with deposits of calcium carbonate in the radial and tangential walls of the phellem. The epidermis breaks away over the encrusted areas, and the gray color which appears in the stem is due to the exposure of such groups of cells. When the calcium carbonate is dissolved out with hydrochloric acid, the walls of the cells give the lignin reaction with phloroglucin.

A section at the base of a stem two and a half centimeters in diameter shows a new feature of considerable interest. This is the appearance in the medullary rays of supernumerary leptome-bundles which Pitard (30) calls tertiary bundles, consisting of semicircular meristematic areas of which the long axes of the meristems are



FIGURE A. *Ibervillea Sonorae* in its native habitat.*

parallel with the medullary rays, so that the axis of any bundle is at right angles to that of the primary bundle next to it. The bundles frequently appear to be collateral and contain hadrome elements on the side next the wood of the primary bundles. The phenomenon is one not infrequently found among the *Cucurbitaceae*.

* This photograph was used for *plate 16* of Carnegie Inst. Publ. No. 6.

It is treated by Leisering (29), deBary (6), Morot (18), Hérail (19), VanTieghem (24), and Weiss (15). Weiss pictures such bundles in the root of *Bryonia*, where masses of leptome are found to be associated with hadrome elements. He concludes that tracheae are separated by dilatation-parenchyma from the primary masses of the hadrome, and serve as centers of meristematic division in the ground-parenchyma, while the semicircular meristem gives rise to the leptome. The meristematic parenchyma-cells are said to come originally from the primary cambium. Scott and Brebner (25) describe their work with *Thladiantha*. They find, elaborating Dutailly's treatment of the same form (7), the elements of the hadrome separated out by dilatation-changes, but differ from Weiss in finding that the leptome bears no constant relation to the tracheae, and that it is partly formed directly from the cambium. This work in each case is on the root. In *Ibervillea* the general dilatation extends to the unlignified parenchyma of the hadrome, and of the parenchyma adjacent to the bundle. Such parenchyma lateral to the hadrome begins to divide and sometimes tracheae are "nipped" off by the changes and isolated with the meristematic cell. In either case the formation of new cells in the dilatation pushes the meristem out into the medullary ray. The meristem then produces leptome but never hadrome, and as the stem increases in size the course of the bundles becomes irregular, so that it is often easy to see the sieve-tubes in longitudinal position. FIGURE 12 shows such a meristem in the midst of a starch-filled parenchyma.

One of the characters of the older secondary stems is the anastomosing of the bundles. Both the leptome and the hadrome frequently run a horizontal course from bundle to bundle, so that the center of the stem is a medley of supernumerary sieve-regions and it is impossible to trace any regular arrangement. As a whole the stem retains the character of its first secondary growth. The parenchma of the medullary rays continues to divide tangentially and radially and the increase in pericycle and cortex is through the same sort of change. Minute fragments are all that remain of the stereome-ring, though opposite these one can still trace the old cortical parenchyma. A relatively large production of phelloderm adds most of the soft tissue in the outer part of the peri-

phery of the tuber, and like the ground-parenchyma the walls of all these cells are pitted and very thick. The periderm renews itself constantly and continues to be sloughed off, while the abundant calcium carbonate gives the gray color to the entire surface. There is no true bark, nor are there any deeper-seated phellogens. The course of the bundles has not been investigated. De Bary says that the bundles of the *Cucurbitaceae* are bundles of the leaf-trace running up two internodes. Accounts are given by Bertrand (9) and by Lotar (12), and later by Leisering (29) and by Tondera (31). The latter, by sections and maceration combined, has secured details of the complicated connection at the nodes which he presents in a series of elaborate diagrams.

FIGURE B. *Ibervillea Sonorae*, four or five years old.

A reference to the description of *Ibervillea* (21) will remind one that this tuber is ordinarily referred to as a root, and that its closest analogies seem to be the roots of *Bryonia* and *Thladiantha*. The picture of the old plant (FIGURE A), with its shoots rising from the tuber, shows the gradual enlargement of the stem, though the appearance of the seedling (FIGURE B) would indicate that the swollen portion includes root, hypocotyl and stem. As far as this investigation goes the formation is stem, and at least half of the swollen portion may claim that distinction, and as the bases of the

shoots are sometimes four and a half centimeters broad one can get intermediate stages between green lianas and tubers. The age of the plants is difficult to estimate. The seedling photographed has been in the greenhouse four years. The shoot in FIGURE 9 is over two years old. The size of the ducts must seemingly be taken as the criterion, and each two or possibly three large tracheae must constitute the growth of a season. There is usually associated with the fall growth the formation of unlignified wood-parenchyma at the side of the hadrome, so that the region presents the jagged appearance noted in FIGURE 13. That the large tubers are fifty years old is doubtless a most conservative estimate.

The pharmaceutical character of the stem is only known empirically to the Indians, who regard it as very poisonous, but more so than has been found to be the case by Miss Emerson and Mr. Welker. The stem shows quantites of starch at the end of the growing season, but the shoots die back so short a distance that it is extremely improbable that the nutritive substances are withdrawn into the tuber. In the desert, the drier condition may effect a change in its habit so that the shoots shrivel further down toward its base. The mechanics of the stem after the breaking up of the stereome-ring are those of a true liana. The plant is not only quick of development in a short rainy season as well as resistant in a dry one, but it is able to twine about surrounding woody growth and to expose a relatively large leaf-surface above the sandy levels. It is perhaps to be noted that the leaves when older have a white spotted appearance, and would doubtless prove to be good material for the study of cystoliths.

The differential characters of the stem may be summed up as follows:

1. The shape is terete, with from ten to fourteen bundles.
2. It possesses endocyclic as well as ectocyclic and commissural sieve-tubes.
3. It has an active inner cambium.
4. The obliteration of the sieve-tubes changes them into a secretory system of which the contents serve as wound-gum.
5. There is a periderm with phellem and phellogen.
6. Deposition of calcium carbonate is abundant.
7. There develop in the secondary stem supernumerary leptome-

bundles formed by meristematic parenchyma of the medullary rays.

8. There is absence of interfascicular cambium and dilatation of all parenchyma.

LITERATURE


1. **Gray, A.** Plantae Lindheimerianae. Boston Jour. Nat. Hist. **6**: 194. 1850.
2. **Naudin, C.** Revue des Cucurbitacées. Ann. Sci. Nat. IV. **12**: 79–164. 1859.
3. **Naudin, C.** Espèces et variétés nouvelles des Cucurbitacées. Ann. Sci. Nat. IV. **16**: 154–199. *pl. 1–4, 13.* 1862.
4. **Sanio, C.** Über endogene Gefässbündelbildung. Bot. Zeit. **22**: 193–200, 201–208, 209–216, 221–226. *pl. 6–8.* 1864.
5. **Vesque, J.** Mémoire sur l'anatomie comparée de l'écorce. Ann. Sci. Nat. VI. **2**: 81–198. *pl. 9–11.* 1875.
6. **DeBary, A.** Vergleichende Anatomie der Vegetationsorgane der Phanerogamen und Farne. Leipzig, 1877.
7. **Dutailly, G.** Sur quelques phénomènes déterminés par l'apparition tardive d'éléments nouveaux dans les tiges et les racines des dicotylédones. Thèse. Paris, 1879.
8. **Dutailly, G.** Recherches anatomiques et organogéniques sur les Cucurbitacées et les Passiflorées. Assoc. Fr. Avanc. Sci. **8** (1879): 711–725. 1880.
9. **Bertrand, C.** Théorie du faisceau. Bull. Sci. Départ. Nord II: **3**. 1880.
10. **Weiss, J.** Anatomie und Physiologie fleishigverdickter Wurzeln. Flora **63**: 81–89, 97–112, 113–123. *pl. 3–4.* 1880.
11. **Cogniaux, A.** In DeCandolle's Monographiae Phanerogamarum. **3**: 726. 1881.
12. **Lotar, H. A.** Essai sur l'anatomie comparée des organes végétatifs et des téguments séminaux des Cucurbitacées. Thèse. Lille, 1881.
13. **Van Tieghem, P.** Sur quelques points de l'anatomie des Cucurbitacées. Bull. Soc. Bot. Fr. **29**: 277–283. 1882.
14. **Petersen, O.** Über das Auftreten bicollateraler Gefässbündel. Bot. Jahrb. **3**: 359–402. *pl. 4–8.* 1882.
15. **Weiss, J.** Das markständige Gefässbündelsystem einiger Dikotyledonen in seiner Beziehung zu den Blattspuren. Bot. Centralb. **15**: 280–295. 318–327, 358–367, 390–397, 401–415. *pl. 1.* 1883.
16. **Fischer, A.** Das Siebröhrensystem von *Cucurbita*. Ber. Deutsch. Bot. Gesells. **1**: 276–279. 1883.
17. **Fischer, A.** Untersuchungen über das Siebröhren-System der Cucurbitaceen. Berlin, 1884.

18. **Morot, L.** Recherches sur le péricycle. Ann. Sci. Nat. VI. **20**: 217–309. *pl. 9–14.* 1885.

19. **Hérail, J.** Recherches sur l'anatomie comparée de la tige des dicotylédones. Ann. Sci. Nat. VII. **2**: 203–314. *pl. 15–20.* 1885.

20. **Fischer, A.** Neue Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Siebröhren. Ber. Verh. Math. Phys. Klasse K. Sächs. Gesellsch. Wiss. **38**: 291–336. *pl. 1–2.* 1886.

21. **Watson, S.** Upon a collection of plants made by Dr. E. Palmer. Proc. Am. Acad. **24**: 51. 1889.

22. **Potter, M. C.** The increase in thickness of the stem of the *Cucurbitaceae.* Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. **7**: 14. 1890.

23. **Lamounette, B.** Recherches sur l'origine morphologique du liber interne. Ann. Sci. Nat. VII. **11**: 193–282. *pl. 10–12.* 1890.

24. **Van Tieghem, P.** Sur les tubes criblés extralibériens et les vaisseaux extraligneux. Jour. de Bot. **5**: 117–128. 1891.

25. **Scott, D. & Brebner, G.** On internal phloem in the root and stem of dicotyledons. Ann. Bot. **5**: 259–300. *pl. 18–20.* 1891.

26. **Schenck, H.** Beiträge zur Anatomie der Lianen. In Schimper's Botanische Mittheilungen aus den Tropen, Heft 5. 1893.

27. **Greene, E. L.** Corrections in nomenclature VI. Erythea **3**: 75. 1895.

28. **Solereder, H.** Über den systematische Anatomie der Dicotyledonen. Stuttgart, 1899.

29. **Leisering, B.** Über die Entwickelungsgeschichte des interxylärem Leptoms bei den Dikotyledonen. Bot. Centralb. **80**: 289–298, 321–331, 369–376, 414–422, 465–470, 497–504. *pl. 1–3.* 1899.

30. **Pitard, C. J.** Sur les faisceaux libériens tertiaires des tiges des Cucurbitacées. Procés Verbaux Soc. Linn. Bordeaux **56**: civ-cviii. 1901.

31. **Tondera, F.** Das Gefässbundelsystem der Cucurbitaceen. Sitz.-ber. Math. Nat. Kl. Akad Wiss. Wien **112**: 23–59. *pl. 1–5.* 1903.

32. **Haberlandt, G.** Physiologische Pflanzenanatomie. Third edition. Leipzig, 1904.

33. **Emerson, J. T. & Welker, W. H.** On the composition and toxic properties of *Ibervillea Sonorae.* Science II. **23**: 336. 1906.

34. **Emerson, J. T. & Welker, W. H.** A further study of the chemistry and pharmacology of *Ibervillea Sonorae.* Science II. **25**: 460. 1907.

35. **MacDougal, D. T.** Morphology and physiology of storage organs. Year Book Carneg. Instit. Wash. **5**: 127. 1907.

**Explanation of plate 24**

The figures were drawn with Leitz lenses and an Abbé camera-lucida and the magnifications have been reduced two-thirds in reproduction.

FIG. 1. Diagram of transverse section of primary stem. $l_1$, outer leptome; $l_2$, inner leptome; *st*, stereome-ring; *h*, hadrome; *x*, bundle pictured in FIGURE 10. × 414.

FIG. 2. Transverse section of portion of cortex of primary stem. *e*, epidermis; *col*, collenchyma; *ch*, chlorenchyma; *os*, obliterated sieve-tubes; *end*, endodermis; *st*, stereome. × 775.

FIGS. 3 and 4. Transverse sections of portions of cortex of young stem. *e*, epidermis; *col*, collenchyma; *st*, stereome; *ec. s*, ectocyclic sieve-tube; *en. s*, endocyclic sieve-tube. × 775.

FIGS. 5–8. Transverse sections of cortex of stems, showing appearance of groups of obliterated sieve-tubes. *st*, stereome; *pr*, parenchyma; *ph*, phellem; *pd*, phelloderm. FIG. 5, periphery of outer leptome; FIGS. 6–8, cortex. × 650.

FIG. 9. Diagram of transverse section of two-year stem. *p*, periderm; *os*, obliterated sieve-tubes; *h*, hadrome; $l_1$, outer leptome; $l_2$, inner leptome; *st*, stereome. × 44.

FIG. 10. Transverse section of bundle of inner ring showing inner cambium of a primary stem. FIG. 11 the same on a secondary stem. *p. d*, pitted duct; *s. d*, spiral duct; *p. h*, protohadrome; $c_2$, inner cambium; *s*, sieve-tube; *os*, obliterated sieve-tube; *gp*, ground-parenchyma. × 480.

FIG. 12. Transverse section of old secondary stem showing tertiary bundle. The arrow shows the direction of the axis of the primary bundle. Lettering as in FIGS. 10 and 11.

FIG. 13. Diagram of section of very old stem. Lettering as before; $b_3$, tertiary bundle. The shaded portions are leptome. × 180.

# New species of fungi

CHARLES HORTON PECK

## Collybia subsulphurea

Pileus fleshy but thin, somewhat tough, reviving under the influence of moisture, broadly convex, often becoming centrally depressed, glabrous, sulfur-yellow, sometimes tinged with pink or pale tan-color in the center, flesh hygrophanous, white when dry, odor strong, fungoid; lamellae thin, narrow, close, rounded behind, adnexed or nearly free, pale sulfur-colored or whitish; stem rather long, tough, glabrous, hollow, tapering downwards, even when moist, striate-sulcate when dry, sulfur-colored or pallid; spores elliptic, 6 $\mu$ long, 3 $\mu$ broad.

Pileus 2.5–6 cm. broad; stem 5–12 cm. long, 2–6 mm. thick.

Cespitose. Among fallen leaves under oak trees. Stockton, Kansas. June. E. Bartholomew.

Closely allied to *C. dryophila* (Bull.) Fr., but larger, more cespitose, of a different color, with a strong odor and smaller spores.

## Omphalia vestita

Pileus thin, membranaceous, convex nearly plane or slightly depressed in the center, minutely pruinose or tomentose, white; lamellae few, very distant, adnate or decurrent, white or whitish; stem slender, short, solid or stuffed, pruinose-pubescent either wholly or on the basal half only, whitish or pallid, often becoming brownish with age; spores subglobose, 4–5 $\mu$ in diameter.

Pileus 2–3 mm. broad; stem 6–10 mm. long, 0.5–1 mm. thick.

Decaying vegetable matter in damp places. Horseshoe island, Ontario, Canada. August. C. Guillet.

This is a very small white species closely related to *O. integrella* Pers. and *O. pusillissima* Peck, from both of which it is separated by the minute tomentose covering of the pileus.

## Omphalia curvipes

Pileus submembranous, convex, umbilicate, glabrous, moist, sometimes obscurely striate on the incurved margin, brown, grayish-brown or dark-gray, sometimes paler in the center when dry; lamellae thin, moderately close, arcuate, adnate or slightly decur-

rent, white or whitish; stem short, curved, stuffed or hollow, white or whitish, slightly thickened and distinctly whitish villose at the base; spores minute, 4 $\mu$ long, 2 $\mu$ broad.

Pileus 4–10 mm. broad; stem 1.5–2.5 cm. long, 1–2 mm. thick.

Decaying wood. Ontario, Canada. August. C. Guillet.

The species belongs to the section *Pyxidatae*. The curving of the stem is due to the place of growth, which is on the sides of prostrate trunks of trees. The villosity at the base of the stem is a conspicuous feature of the species.

### Lactarius rufulus

Pileus fleshy, firm, broadly convex becoming subinfundibuliform, brownish-red, flesh white, milk scanty, yellowish-white, taste acrid; lamellae close, adnate or slightly decurrent, pinkish-yellow becoming darker with age and pruinose; stem equal or slightly tapering upward, stuffed, often tufted and showing yellowish-brown strigose hairs at the base, sometimes radicating, colored like but paler than the pileus; spores creamy-white, globose, verruculose, 8–10 $\mu$ in diameter.

Pileus 5–10 cm. broad; stem 4–8 cm. long, 5–6 mm. thick.

Rich soil and leaf-mold under oak trees. Stanford University, California. March. Miss A. M. Patterson and S. Nohara.

This species resembles *Lactarius rufus* (Scop.) Fr. in color, but differs from it in its stouter habit, cespitose mode of growth, absence of an umbo, and yellowish-tinted spores.

### Lactarius xanthogalactus

Pileus fleshy, convex or nearly plane becoming infundibuliform with age, glabrous, zonate, pinkish-yellow becoming reddish-brown in drying, flesh yellowish, milk yellow, taste acrid; lamellae close, adnate or decurrent, pinkish-yellow, pruinose when old and dry; stem cylindric or sometimes compressed, stuffed or hollow, mealy-pruinose or subglandular, whitish or pallid; spores globose, 7–8 $\mu$ in diameter.

Pileus 5–6 cm. broad; stem 5–6 cm. long, 1–1.5 cm. thick.

Under live-oak trees. Stanford University, California. February. Miss A. M. Patterson.

The pinkish-yellow zonate pileus, yellow milk, and acrid or peppery taste are distinguishing characters of this species.

### Entoloma modestum

Pileus thin, campanulate or convex, glabrous, obtuse, hygrophanous, dark smoky-brown and striatulate when moist, isabelline or pale grayish-brown when dry; lamellae rather broad, subdistant, adnate, at first pallid, then flesh-colored; stem slender, equal, hollow, glabrous, colored like the pileus; spores angular, uninucleate, obliquely apiculate at one end, 10–14 $\mu$ long, 8–9 $\mu$ broad.

Pileus 1.5–2.5 cm. broad; stem 2.5–4 cm. long, 2–4 mm. thick.

Stow, Massachusetts. May. G. E. Morris and S. Davis.

### Eccilia cinericola

Pileus thin, fragile, glabrous, slightly scabrous, broadly convex, becoming expanded and broadly umbilicate or centrally depressed, white tinged with yellow, becoming cream-colored with age; lamellae thick, distant, broad, adnate or slightly decurrent, sometimes slightly sinuate, white becoming pink, dusted by the spores; stem subcartilaginous, fragile, hollow, slightly enlarged at the top, white at first, then colored like the pileus; spores subglobose, angular, 10–12 $\mu$ long, 8–10 $\mu$ broad.

Pileus 1.2–2.5 cm. broad; stem 2–2.5 cm. long, 2 mm. thick.

Gravelly ground among grasses, specially where coal ashes have been lying for a long time. Boston, Massachusetts. June. S. Davis.

### Naucoria tabacina bicolor var. nov.

Scarcely differing from the typical form except in the pileus, which with the escape of moisture becomes ochroleucous or a pale creamy-white.

Stow, Massachusets. May. G. E. Morris and S. Davis.

### Agaricus Pattersonae

Pileus fleshy, firm, convex or nearly plane, glabrous or minutely silky, white or whitish, often mottled with brownish squamules, flesh firm, white, taste fungoid; lamellae close, free, pink becoming blackish-brown or black with age; stem equal or slightly tapering upward, firm, stuffed, bulbous, white or whitish, the annulus white, often rupturing and partly adhering to the margin of the pileus; spores broadly elliptic, 8–9 $\mu$ long, 5–6 $\mu$ broad.

Pileus 6–14 cm. broad; stem 7–12 cm. long, 2–3 cm. thick.

Ground under pine and cypress trees. Stanford University, California. January. Miss A. M. Patterson.

This species is similar to *Agaricus bulbosus* McCl. in having a bulbous stem, but it differs in color (no yellowish hues being found in it), in flavor, and in the size of the spores. It is respectfully dedicated to its discoverer.

### Psathyrella caespitosa

Pileus thin, convex, subumbonate, striate or subsulcate on the margin, grayish-brown, flesh gray, taste farinaceous; lamellae thin, subdistant, adnate, cinereous, becoming black or blackish-brown; stem slender, hollow, mealy and white at the top, brownish below; spores black, oblong or narrowly elliptic, 15–20 $\mu$ long, 8–10 $\mu$ broad.

Pileus 1.5–2.5 cm. broad; stem 6–7 cm. long, 2–3 mm. thick.

Cespitose; in rich soil and grassy places under sycamore trees. San José, California. February. Miss A. M. Patterson.

A species well-marked by its tufted mode of growth, there being 15 or more individuals in a tuft. In the dried state the pileus appears to be rugose-striate.

### Hydnum Kauffmani

Pileus dimidiate, sessile, convex or nearly plane, soft but tough or coriaceous, strigose with rather long subappressed fascicles of fibers, uneven, subochraceous, flesh whitish, radiately fibrous; aculei subcylindric or subulate, 2–3 mm. long, sometimes adhering to each other and forming clusters as if gelatinous, acute, creamy-white, becoming darker in drying, sometimes stained with yellow, especially around the margin; spores hyaline, elliptic, 4–5 $\mu$ long, 2–3 $\mu$ broad.

Pileus about 6 cm. broad; stem about 4 cm. long.

Decaying cottonwood. Marquette, Michigan. August. C. H. Kauffman, to whom the species is respectfully dedicated. The adhering aculei constitute a prominent distinguishing character.

### Macrophoma tiliacea

Perithecia scattered, nestling in the bark, covered by the epidermis which is minutely punctured by the erumpent ostiola, depressed or broadly conic, pierced by a circular ostiolum, black; spores oblong, hyaline, rounded at the ends, 18–30 $\mu$ long, 8–9 $\mu$ broad.

Dead branches of basswood, *Tilia americana* L. Oberlin, Ohio. March. F. O. Grover.

### Cucurbitaria erratica

Perithecia cespitose, subglobose, more or less hairy, black, penetrating to the inner bark and forming orbicular or oblong clusters, soon erumpent and surrounded by the ruptured epidermis; asci cylindric, about 200 $\mu$ long, 20–22 $\mu$ broad; spores commonly monostichous, oblong, colored, 5–7-septate, with 1–3 cells longitudinally divided, constricted in the middle, 30–40 $\mu$ long, 15–20 $\mu$ broad, the basal half of the spore often more narrow than the other, paraphyses absent.

Dead branches of Ohio buckeye, *Aesculus glabra* Willd. Oberlin, Ohio. March. F. O. Grover.

This species is referred provisionally to the genus *Cucurbitaria*, from which it differs in its hairy perithecia and in the absence of paraphyses. It approaches *C. Sorbi* Karst. in some of its characters.

GEOLOGICAL HALL,
ALBANY, NEW YORK.

# A midsummer journey through the coastal plain of the Carolinas and Virginia

ROLAND M. HARPER

## INTRODUCTION

In discussing the vegetation of the Atlantic coastal plain, a territory about ten times as long as wide, it becomes expedient to divide the region transversely into several districts of convenient size. For this purpose there are probably no better natural boundaries than the large rivers which rise in the highlands and cross the whole width of the coastal plain.* That portion between the James River and the Savannah, embracing the whole of the coastal plain of the Carolinas and about half that of Virginia, may conveniently be treated as a unit, since these two rivers seem to mark the divisions between perceptibly different parts of the coastal plain, and as far as known there is no other boundary of equal importance lying between them.

The Savannah River coincides pretty closely with the boundary between the topographically diversified and the comparatively monotonous portions of the coastal plain, as shown below, while the James seems to mark the northeastern limit of *Pinus palustris*, *P. serotina*, *Aristida stricta*, *Quercus Catesbaei*, and numerous other characteristic pine-barren plants. (There is, however, almost nothing on record about the flora of the coastal plain of Virginia north of the James River, doubtless chiefly because most of the counties in that part of the state have never had railroad facilities.) The James and its tributary, the Appomattox, are the southernmost rivers whose estuaries extend all the way across the coastal plain.

The region in question has been worked over more or less by botanists and other observers for 200 years or so, and there is consequently a considerable amount of information about the

* A similar method has been employed by McGee (Ann. Rep. U. S. Geol. Surv. 12[1]: 360–364. 1892) in discussing the topography, though his resulting districts do not coincide with mine.

plants of that part of the country scattered through literature which may be roughly classified as follows:

1. Descriptive manuals, such as those of Elliott, Chapman, Wood, and Small, covering more than one state, making little or no distinction between the coastal plain and other natural regions, and containing no rational treatment of habitats.

2. Monographs of families or genera, or scattered descriptions of species, too numerous to mention.*

3. Works relating to trees primarily, such as Sargent's Tenth Census report,† Pinchot & Ashe on the trees of North Carolina,‡ Mohr's Timber Pines,§ and Bulletins 43 and 56 ‖ of the U. S. Bureau (formerly Division) of Forestry, on South Carolina.

4. State and local lists, lacking details of habitat or distribution, or both; such as Curtis on North Carolina, 1867, Croom on Newbern, 1837, and Wood & McCarthy on Wilmington, 1887.

5. Notes on selected species, or narratives of botanical expeditions, with few or no references to earlier workers in the same fields. Among these are Bartram's Travels, Michaux's Journal,¶ and several short semi-popular papers on Dismal Swamp and vicinity, most of which are cited in (and practically superseded by) Mr. Kearney's elaborate survey of that region.

---

* For the Altamaha Grit region of Georgia about two years ago I could find less than a dozen works of this class, but the number for the Virginia-Carolina coastal plain would doubtless run into the hundreds.

† Vol. 9. 1884. The forests of the Carolinas are briefly described on pages 515–519, with four maps.

‡ Bull. 6, N. C. Geol. Surv. 1898.

§ Bull. 13, Division of Forestry, U. S. Dep. Agr. 1896. Revised 1897.

‖ Bulletin 56, on a working plan for forest lands in Berkeley County, by C. S. Chapman, was published early in 1906, and contains considerable interesting information which will be referred to farther on; but the list of trees and shrubs on pages 45 and 46 is so misleading that it should not be allowed to remain unchallenged. For example, the cypress is probably not all *Taxodium distichum*, and the "black gum" is almost certainly *Nyssa biflora* rather than *N. sylvatica*, which is rare in the coastal plain, especially in such flat country as that under consideration. The "titi" is doubtless *Cyrilla*, for it is too far north and east for *Cliftonia*. The "hurrah bush" must be *Pieris nitida* (which goes by a similar name in Okefinokee Swamp), for *P. floribunda* (*Andromeda*) is confined to the mountains, as far as known. The buckeye is in all probability *Aesculus Pavia*, and the "prickly ash" *Aralia spinosa*.

¶ Journal of André Michaux, 1787–1796. Edited by C. S. Sargent. Proc. Am. Phil. Soc. 26: 1–145. 1889. Part of the same is reprinted in vol. 3 of Thwaites's "Early Western Travels," 1904.

6. Descriptions of the vegetation of restricted areas, with plants classified according to habitat in a scientific manner, like Kearney's reports on Ocracoke Island and Dismal Swamp in the fifth volume of the Contributions from the U. S. National Herbarium, and Coker's paper on the Isle of Palms, S. C.*

7. A number of primarily geological, geographical, descriptive, agricultural, ethnological and even ornithological works, in which plants are mentioned only incidentally and mostly by their common names, if at all, furnish valuable information to one familiar with the principles of plant distribution in the coastal plain, and should not be overlooked. Among the best of these are some of the early reports of the North Carolina Geological Survey by Emmons and Kerr, the reports on cotton production † by Kerr and Hammond in the 6th volume of the Tenth Census reports (1884), the soil surveys published by the U. S. Department of Agriculture during the present century ‡, the supplements to Redway & Hinman's geographies, on North Carolina by Cobb and on South Carolina by Glenn; and Water Supply and Irrigation paper no. 114 of the U. S. Geological Survey, which contains up-to-date though brief summaries of the present knowledge of the stratigraphy of the three states in question (by Darton, Fuller, and Glenn), as well as of all the other eastern states. (References to many other primarily geological works for each state, which are worth consulting, may be found in Bulletins 127, 188, 189, and 301 of the U. S. Geological Survey, which are bibliographies of North American geological literature from 1731 to 1905.)

But even yet, as may be inferred from the foregoing, the vege-

* Torreya 5: 135–145. *f.* 1–4. 1905.

† Under this too modest title are concealed some of the best geographical descriptions of the southeastern states ever published, including among other things valuable notes on the native vegetation. The essential geographical features of all these cotton production reports, including the maps, are condensed into a little known pamphlet by Dr. Eugene A. Smith, reprinted from the 4th report of the U. S. Entomological Commission, pp. 59–80 and 2 maps. 1884.

‡ The soil survey reports hitherto published for the region in question are those of the Norfolk area, Virginia; Raleigh to Newbern, the Craven area, and Perquimans, Pasquotank, Duplin, and New Hanover counties, North Carolina; and the Darlington, Orangeburg, and Charleston areas, South Carolina. Others for each state are said to be in preparation. These reports, which contain excellent maps and other interesting matter, would be a little more satisfactory if their authors had taken advantage of some easily accessible earlier descriptions of the same regions.

tation of the Virginia-Carolina coastal plain is practically undescribed, except for the vicinity of Dismal Swamp, and two or three spots on the seacoast farther south. The geology of the region is also by no means as well known as one might wish, chiefly because of the scarcity of rock outcrops and the lack of diversity in the topography, as compared with the corresponding portions of the Gulf States.

## NARRATIVE

With a view of gaining some knowledge of the region in question at first-hand, I made it a point on the way from Alabama to New York in July, 1906, to travel through the coastal plain most of the way, and to see as much of it as possible in the few days at my disposal. My principal objects in taking such a roundabout route were: first, to ascertain whether the Altamaha Grit formation, which I had just been studying in Georgia,* extended beyond the Savannah River into South Carolina; second, to see if the ranges of certain plants followed geological belts approximately parallel to the coast, as so many do in Georgia and Alabama; and third, to discover the northeastern limits of as many coastal plain species as possible, and the reasons therefor. What success was attained in solving these and other problems which presented themselves will appear in the following pages.

From the time I entered South Carolina by crossing the Savannah River a few miles below Augusta, until I reached Richmond on the banks of the James, five days later, I traveled entirely in the coastal plain, by daylight, and over railroads which were new to me (except the first and last 25 miles or so), so that new facts were gathered on nearly every mile of the journey. Every species recognizable from the car-window was noted as many times as possible (except in the case of a few of the commonest trees), and no botanizing was done on foot, except a very little near Charleston and Florence, S. C., and one afternoon on and near Wrightsville Beach, N. C.

**Itinerary.** — My itinerary through the three states was as follows: From Augusta to Yemassee and Charleston on the afternoon of July 25th, from Charleston to Florence, S. C., the next afternoon,

* See Torreya 6: 241–246. 1906.

from Florence to Wilmington, N. C., and Wrightsville Beach on the 27th, from Wilmington to Rocky Mount and Tarboro, N. C., and Norfolk, Va., on the 28th, and from Norfolk to Petersburg, Richmond and northward on the afternoon of the 30th. By this zigzag route I crossed the coastal plain several times while working gradually lengthwise of it, thus obtaining a broad view of it which could hardly be surpassed in so short a time. Augusta, Rocky Mount, Petersburg, and Richmond are fall-line cities, Charleston, Wilmington, and Norfolk are seaports, and Florence, at another of the angles of the route, is about two-thirds of the way from the coast to the fall-line. From Richmond to New York the rest of my way lay along the fall-line — the coastal plain between these points being so interrupted by bays and estuaries that one cannot travel far in it by rail — and this part of the route, which was already more or less familiar to me, was traversed in the dark.

**Topography and geology.** — The topography of the Virginia-Carolina coastal plain seems very simple and monotonous, as compared with that of Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi. Slightly undulating near the fall-line, where the average altitude is about 300 feet, the relief, the general slope, and the elevation gradually and almost insensibly decrease toward the coast. Here there seem to be no sudden changes in the aspect of the country, such as are encountered at intervals in crossing the coastal plain almost anywhere between the Savannah and Mississippi Rivers, where the different geological divisions are so well marked by their topography and vegetation that it requires no knowledge of paleontology, and not a great deal of experience, to distinguish them.

On this journey of about 700 miles through three states I do not remember seeing any rocks, bluffs, escarpments, hills, ravines, gullies, springs, or hammocks, or passing through any railroad cuts deep enough to obstruct the view, unless perhaps a few near the fall-line. The flatness of most of this region (which is quite comparable in this respect with the coastal plain or southern portion of Long Island and the flat pine-barren region of Georgia) could easily be inferred, with the aid of a good map, from the straightness of the railroads. No curves were noticed in a distance of about 50 miles through Pender and Duplin counties, N. C., and

there are probably other tangents of equal or even greater length in the same general region.*

One or two slight exceptions to the general monotony of the topography toward the coast may be worth noting. In the immediate vicinity of Yemassee, S. C., the country seems just a little more broken than it is for some distance farther inland; and the city of Wilmington is remarkably hilly for a southern seaport, perhaps more so than any other place so near the coast between New York and Florida. The topography between Wilmington and Wrightsville Beach, a distance of ten or eleven miles, seems as undulating as in many places in the Altamaha Grit region of Georgia,† and looking inland from the beach the land is seen to have a decided elevation, quite different from the extreme flatness which characterizes the coasts of South Carolina and Georgia. The exact cause of these local variations in topography is probably unknown, but it seems from the soil survey map of New Hanover County (published in February of this year) that Wilmington is on the sand-hills of the Cape Fear River, one of the largest rivers in the state, so this may partly account for its topography.

The flatness of the greater part of this coastal plain is evidently correlated with a state of affairs well known to geologists, namely, that the Cretaceous and Tertiary strata in Virginia and the Carolinas are much more nearly horizontal than they are farther west and south, so that Cretaceous rocks are exposed near Wilmington, and Miocene near the fall-line in all three states. This approach to horizontality seems to culminate in the latitude of Cape Hatteras, according to several geologists who have investigated it.

Ponds are seen at frequent intervals in the pine-barrens of South Carolina, less frequently in North Carolina, and rarely if at all in Virginia. As in Georgia, most of them seem too shallow to contain water throughout the year. In North Carolina, but scarcely in the other two states, are several large lakes, most of them not very far from the coast. The only one which I passed within sight of is Lake Waccamaw, in Columbus County, but Kerr‡ mentions fifteen others. At present they do not seem to

* See Glenn, Jour. School Geog. **2**: 91. 1898; also Bull. 43, U. S. Bureau of Forestry, *pl. 4–13*; and Torreya **6**: 41. 1906.

† See Bull. Torrey Club **32**: 145. 1905; Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. **17**: 23. 1906.

‡ Rep. Geol. Surv. N. C. for 1875, page 13.

be as well known to botanists as they are to ornithologists, * but they should be most interesting places for ecological study.

The streams of the Virginia-Carolina coastal plain can be divided into two classes according to length, namely, the muddy, almost opaque, rivers which rise in the Piedmont region or in the mountains beyond, and the smaller coffee-colored streams which rise in the sandy and little eroded coastal plain. † Those of the former class which I crossed (between the Savannah and the James) are the Santee, Lynch's, and Peedee rivers in South Carolina, the Cape Fear, Neuse, Tar, Roanoke, and Chowan in North Carolina, and the Appomattox in Virginia. More will be said about some of these later. To the latter class belong the Salkehatchie or Combahee, Edisto, Black, and Lumber rivers in South Carolina, the Northeast Cape Fear in North Carolina, the Blackwater in Virginia, and all the creeks and branches.‡ None of the rivers seemed to have deep channels or well defined banks where I crossed them, being bordered on both sides by extensive swamps.‡

Unmistakable fluvial sand-hills § were seen only on the left sides of the Peedee, Lumber, and Blackwater rivers, and the right side of the Northeast Cape Fear opposite Castle Hayne; though there seemed to be a faint development of them on the left side of the Neuse near Goldsboro.‖ The flora of all these areas appeared to be much less varied than that in similar situations in Georgia, where most of the known sand-hill species may be found.

As far as the geology is concerned I can add very little to what is already known of this region. In South Carolina, especially in Hampton County, I looked closely for evidences of the Altamaha Grit, but did not see any of the rock of this formation,¶ or even any of the characteristic topography, which is unmistak-

* For some pretty good illustrations of one of them see T. G. Pearson, Bird-Lore **7**: 121–126. 1905.

† A similar distinction was made nearly 200 years ago by Catesby in the appendix to the second volume of his "Natural History of Carolina."

‡ For definition of these terms, see Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. **17**: 25. 1906.

§ See Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. **17**: 25–27. 1906.

‖ See in this connection Field Operations of the Bureau of Soils for 1900, page 200.

¶ This fact in itself, however, does not prove anything, for outcrops of it are very scarce even in Georgia (see Torreya **6**: 245–246. 1906).

ably displayed in the adjoining county of Screven in Georgia.* In most of the railroad cuts in South Carolina, however, could be seen that red-and-white mottled loam which lies between the Grand Gulf and Lafayette formations in Alabama and Mississippi and seems to intergrade with the Altamaha Grit in Georgia.† Going northeastward from the Savannah River this mottled phase seemed to become gradually paler and more homogeneous, until by the time Virginia was reached it was no longer distinguishable from the Lafayette if it was present at all.

The Columbia sand seems to cover the greater part of the area examined, as has been shown by McGee ‡ and others, but rather thinly, except on the sand-hills along the fall-line and rivers, and the dunes along the coast. The Lafayette loam immediately underlying it is exposed over considerable areas up toward the fall-line, just as it is in the upper third of the coastal plain in Georgia and the greater part of the same province in Alabama.

**Effects of civilization.** — Some of the publications cited herein, particularly the reports on trees by Mohr and by Ashe,§ and the soil survey reports, describe the effects of civilization in the region under consideration, but as economic conditions are continually changing, a few more words on the subject may be of interest.

Those pioneer industries, turpentining and lumbering of long-leaf pine, are decidedly on the wane in the Carolinas, and will doubtless soon be practically at an end unless conservative methods are speedily and widely adopted. I do not remember seeing a single mature and round (*i. e.*, unboxed) long-leaf pine in either state, though this may be partly explainable by the fact that all the railroads I traveled on after leaving Georgia are comparatively old. Along the newer lines, and away from all railroads and streams, conditions should of course be a little better. *Pinus Taeda* now furnishes a large proportion of the pine lumber of the region, and is even being tapped in a few places for turpentine, but with what success I did not ascertain.

* The formation may possibly occur in Beaufort County (the southernmost in South Carolina) for *Pinckneya*, *Cliftonia*, *Nyssa Ogeche*, and *Serenoa* have been found there, and apparently nowhere else in the state. (See Bull. Torrey Club **32**: 147. 1905.)

† See Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. **17**: 23; Torreya **6**: 241. 1906.

‡ Ann. Rep. U. S. Geol. Surv. **12**[1]: 386–388. 1892.

§ Bulletins 5 to 7 of the North Carolina Geological Survey.

The proportion of cleared land in eastern Virginia and the Carolinas seems somewhat greater than in South Georgia, doubtless because these more northeasterly states have been settled longer, and because their shorter distance from the great centers of population makes truck farming more profitable than it is in Georgia. As in Georgia, the destruction caused by agriculture has been much greater outside of the pine-barren region than within it.* The density of population in the regions traversed (outside of the cities of course) ranged from about 20 to 40 inhabitants per square mile in 1900, and is probably very little greater at the present time, for the evidences of recent growth which are conspicuous all through the pine-barrens of Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi † were scarcely noticeable in these older states.

**Vegetation.** — The study of the laws of distribution of vegetation in the coastal plain northeast of the Savannah River is by no means easy, especially as there is so little previous work to go by. The correlations between ranges of species and vegetation types on the one hand and the areas of various Tertiary formations on the other, which are so pronounced in Georgia and Alabama, seem to be very indistinct in the Carolinas, doubtless chiefly because of the flatness of the country and the approximate horizontality of the strata, already mentioned. Next to the water-content of the soil, which here of course depends mainly on the local topography, and historical development, which has to be taken into consideration everywhere, the present distribution of plants in the region under consideration probably depends on the extent and thickness of the Columbia sand as much as on any other one factor.

In general it may be said that between the Roanoke and Savannah rivers the pine-barrens proper ‡ extend about two-thirds of

* This is pretty well shown by the maps in the Tenth Census reports showing the ratio between the area cultivated in cotton and the total area. On account of the prevalence of cleared land I was able to make comparatively few notes in such counties as Aiken, Barnwell, and Florence in South Carolina, and Wayne, Wilson, and all north of there in North Carolina.

† See Bull. Torrey Club **32**: 142. 1905; Torreya **6**: 200. 1906; Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. **17**: 120. 1906.

‡ See Bull. Torrey Club **32**: 452. 1905; Torreya **6**: 42. 1906; Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. **17**: 16. 1906.

the way from the coast to the fall-line, and that in the remaining third (exclusive of the fall-line sand-hills) oaks and other angiospermous trees predominate, just as in the upper third of the coastal plain of Georgia. On the way from Augusta to Yemassee, although *Pinus palustris* can be seen in scattered groups or individuals nearly the whole distance,* the real pine-barrens only begin about the inland edge of Hampton County, and seem to terminate near its coastward edge.† Between Yemassee and Charleston the railroad passes mostly through the maritime or littoral region (very similar to that of Georgia ‡), where *Pinus palustris* is rare and *P. Taeda* common. Beyond Charleston the limits of the pine-barrens are less clearly defined.

The illustrations in Bulletins 43 and 56 § of the U. S. Bureau of Forestry give an excellent idea of the general appearance of the South Carolina pine-barrens, and the forests of the North Carolina coastal plain have been so well described by Mr. Ashe in Bulletins 5 and 6 of the North Carolina Geological Survey that it would be useless to attempt to improve on his observations with so little preparation; but there is still room for a few notes on the herbaceous vegetation, and for some statistics of distribution, which may serve as suggestions for future work in this region.

Pine-barren vegetation, if we may judge by the number of species in a given area, seems to center at present in Georgia and Florida,‖ and as a rule grows gradually poorer and less typical with increasing distance from this center, the proportion of older species from the highlands at the same time increasing, as I had excellent opportunity to observe on this trip. *Pinus Elliottii*, whose distribution in Georgia coincides almost exactly with the pine-barrens, extends only a short distance into South Carolina.¶ *Pinus*

* In Georgia it seems to skip a good deal of the Eocene region. See Bull. Torrey Club **31**: 15. 1904; **32**: 456. 1905; Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. **17**: 305. 1906.

† This is corroborated by Hammond's agricultural map of South Carolina in the Tenth Census report already cited, and by Glenn's physical outline map in his South Carolina supplement to Redway & Hinman's geography.

‡ See Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. **17**: 20. 1906.

§ It should be observed that *plate 1* in Bulletin 56 is from the same photograph as *plate 12* in Bulletin 43, which purports to show *Pinus Elliottii* among other things, and therefore was not taken in Berkeley County.

‖ See Torreya **7**: 43; Science II. **25**: 540. 1907.

¶ For details see the latter part of this paper. In the other direction it is not

*palustris*, which is preëminently the tree of the pine-barrens, very gradually gives way to *P. Taeda* northeastward, disappearing entirely before reaching the James River. In fact there are in the Carolinas some limited areas which might reasonably be called pine-barrens where the pines are all *P. Taeda*. * This is probably never the case within the range of *P. Elliottii*.

A notable exception to the general thinning out of the pine-barren vegetation northeastward is found in the southern corner of North Carolina, where *Pinus palustris* becomes again the prevailing pine, and the flora is perceptibly richer than it is a little to the southwest as well as to the north, with little if any corresponding increase in diversity of habitats. Some of the species characterizing this minor pine-barren center are enumerated below.

Within the pine-barrens the local diversity of the vegetation is of course governed mainly by the slight inequalities of the surface. The greater part of the area consists of dry and moist pine-barrens, the latter mostly occupying broad shallow depressions or nearly flat areas, rather than evident slopes as in the Altamaha Grit region of Georgia. The ponds of course contain their own characteristic flora, quite different from that of the moist pine-barrens. All the streams are bordered by swamps, the width of each of which is approximately proportional to the volume of the stream. As in all pine-barren regions, most of the angiospermous trees are confined to the vicinity of streams, and the swamps of rivers originating above the fall-line have quite a different flora from those of the pine-barren streams, as will be illustrated below in discussing the distribution and habitat of certain species.

Scattered through the flat parts of North Carolina, and to a lesser extent in adjacent territory, are many "pocosins." † These

known to extend beyond Mississippi. (See Torreya 6: 200, 201. 1906.) *Serenoa serrulata*, *Quercus geminata*, *Cliftonia monophylla* and several other species have a similar distribution.

*Civilization has of course changed the relative abundance of these trees to some extent, but in making the statements in this paragraph I have tried to reconstruct the primeval conditions as far as possible.

†Often spelled "pocosons." The use of this term seems to be almost confined to eastern North Carolina, but it appears to some extent in other states, though with variations in meaning in different localities, as in the case of several other native habitat names, like swamp, hammock, prairie, bay, savanna, brake, etc. The northernmost record of such a word which I have come across is in York County, Virginia, where

are described or mentioned in nearly all works of a geographical nature dealing with the coastal plain of North Carolina, especially the publications of Emmons,* Kerr,† Ashe, ‡ and the U. S. Bureau of Soils, § but in all these descriptions unfortunately most of the plants are mentioned only by their common names, and nothing like a complete list of species is attempted. A pocosin may be briefly described as an extensive flat, damp, sandy or peaty area, supporting a scattered growth of pine (mostly *Pinus serotina*) and a very dense growth of shrubs, mostly evergreens, giving the whole a decided heath-like aspect — the term heath being used here in the sense of a certain type of vegetation ‖ rather than as the name of a certain class of plants, though these shrubs are indeed largely of the Ericaceae and allied families. What the earlier and later stages of a pocosin may be, probably no one has ever determined; but this would be a most interesting subject for ecological study. Pocosins have no exact counterpart in Georgia, but in their vegetation, though not so much in topography, they much resemble some

there is a settlement named Poquoson on a river of the same name. In South Carolina the term seems to be used in a somewhat different sense. John Lawson, in his "New Voyage to Carolina," published in 1709, speaks of "Percoarson, a sort of low Land," near the Santee River, containing cypress trees (which are not at all characteristic of the North Carolina pocosins), and the "pocosons" described by C. S. Chapman in Bulletin 56 of the U. S. Bureau of Forestry seem to be nothing more nor less than cypress ponds. (On the other hand, the "savannas" of these two writers correspond more nearly with pocosins as here understood.) Just as I was leaving Alabama on this same trip I heard of a "pocosin" in Pike County (Eocene region of the coastal plain) which from the description given must have been much like some of the hammocks of South Georgia and adjacent Florida (particularly those described by Croom in Am. Jour. Sci. **26**: 318. 1834). In Georgia, however, I have never found the slightest evidence of the use of such a word. It is a curious coincidence that while pocosins, like hammocks, are confined to the coastal plain, they do not seem to be known within the range of *Pinus Elliottii*. This is illustrated by the absence of the term from Georgia, Florida, and the Alabama pine-barrens, as far as known, and by Bulletin 43 of the U. S. Bureau of Forestry, which treats of a part of South Carolina not far distant from that described in Bulletin 56, but within the range of this pine. In this bulletin the word pocosin is not used, and no feature of that kind is even described.

* 2d Rep. N. C. Geol. Surv. (Agriculture of the eastern counties), page 38. 1858.

† Rep. N. C. Geol. Surv. for 1875; also report on cotton production in 6th vol. of Tenth Census, 1884.

‡ Bull. N. C. Geol. Surv. **5**: 17, 28, 34; **6**: 179–181.

§ Field Operations of the Bureau of Soils, **1900**: 36, 38, 204–205, *pl. 25*; **1903**: 269–270; **1905**: (in reports on Perquimans, Pasquotank and Duplin counties, not yet paged consecutively).

‖ See Cowles, Bot Gaz. **27**: 367–369. *f. 24–26.* 1899.

of the sand-hill bogs of the Altamaha Grit region,* the low islands in Okefinokee Swamp, and some densely bushy places in the flat pine-barrens near the coast.

In the pine-barrens of Brunswick and Pender Counties, North Carolina, one occasionally passes extensive flat meadow-like areas, or savannas, with no shrubs and very few trees, recalling the "pine meadows" of southeastern Mississippi.† One such place near Burgaw ‡ contained no trees or even stumps in an area of several hundred acres, being a veritable prairie, and at the same time apparently perfectly natural. The vegetation of such places is composed chiefly of grasses (especially *Campulosus aromaticus*) and other monocotyledons, as might be expected.

**Floristics.** — The total number of species noted in the three states in five days was about 200, all seen and identified from the car windows except a few near Florence, S. C., on the morning of July 27, and about thirty in the vicinity of Wrightsville Beach, N. C., on the afternoon of the same day, which had not been observed from the railroads. Counting both native and introduced species, the monocotyledons constitute 25.7 per cent. of the angiosperms in my notes for this trip; while of the native angiosperms alone, the monocotyledons are 26.2 per cent. Although these figures are a little less than those I have obtained for several other coastal plain areas,§ the discrepancy is easily explainable by the fact that all the trees and nearly all the shrubs are dicotyledons, and my car-window notes are of course more complete for these than for the herbs. Considering the comparatively small number of species recorded, the correspondence seems remarkably close.

About 45 species noted in South Carolina were not seen after leaving that state, and some 15 others were evidently more frequent in South than in North Carolina. These 60 species, or the majority of them, can be divided into several groups according to habitat and origin, as follows:

First, plants of alluvial swamps along the larger rivers, a habi-

* See Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. **17**: *pl. 12. f. 2.* 1906.

† See Torreya **6**: 204–205. 1906; also McGee, Ann. Rep. U. S. Geol. Surv. **12**[1]: 368, 475. 1892.

‡ Described in Kerr's report for 1875 (pages 19, 178) as the "Burgaw Savannah."

§ See Torreya **5**: 207–210. 1906.

tat which is evidently best developed in the Mississippi valley.* *Tecoma radicans, Bignonia crucigera, Fraxinus caroliniana, Hibiscus militaris, Gleditsia aquatica, Platanus occidentalis, Planera aquatica, Populus* sp., *Hicoria aquatica, Sabal glabra.* Most of these occur somewhere in North Carolina, but probably less abundantly. Thirty years ago Prof. L. F. Ward † commented on the absence of some of the same species from Dismal Swamp.

Second, plants chiefly confined to hammocks and allied habitats. *Polymnia Uvedalia, Batodendron arboreum, Vitis rotundifolia, Cercis canadensis, Magnolia grandiflora, Quercus virginiana, Fagus americana, Smilax lanceolata, Tillandsia usneoides, Juniperus virginiana.*

Third, plants of pine-barren ponds, a kind of habitat which, as already noted, seems to be more frequent in South Carolina than in the other two states. *Asclepias lanceolata, Sabbatia campanulata, Oxypolis filiformis, Ludwigia suffruticosa, Hypericum fasciculatum, Polygala cymosa, Castalia odorata, Pontederia cordata, Rynchospora corniculata, Panicum digitarioides, Taxodium imbricarium, Pinus Elliottii.*

Fourth, plants of fresh marshes and ditches, doubtfully indigenous. *Sambucus canadensis, Aeschynomene virginica, Juncus effusus, Lemna* sp., *Limnobium Spongia, Typha latifolia, Azolla caroliniana.*

Fifth, weeds, mostly from the tropics or with tropical affinities. *Eupatorium compositifolium, Ambrosia artemisiaefolia, Polypremum procumbens, Passiflora incarnata, Sida rhombifolia, Euphorbia maculata, E. eriogonoides, Bradburya virginiana, Glottidium vesicarium, Cyperus rotundus, C. Iria, Echinochloa colona.*

Of about 30 species seen in both Carolinas but not in Virginia, some belong to the same categories as those just mentioned, but the majority are typical pine-barren plants, which are rarely or never seen as far north as Virginia.

A very interesting group of plants comprises those noted oftener within about 50 miles of Wilmington than anywhere else on the whole journey. Several of these were not seen in South

* See Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. 17: 74. 1906; Torreya 7: 44. 1907; Science II. 25: 541. 1907.

† Field & Forest 3: 29. 1877.

Carolina at all, though they nearly all grow in Georgia. The following is a somewhat incomplete list: *

*Marshallia graminifolia* (Walt.) Small.
*Pterocaulon undulatum* (Walt.) Mohr.
*Aster squarrosus* Walt.
*Chondrophora nudata* (Michx.) Britton.
*Vernonia angustifolia* Michx.
*Sabbatia lanceolata* (Walt.) T. & G.
*Vaccinium crassifolium* Andr.†
*Rhexia Alifanus* Walt.
*Gordonia Lasianthus* L.
*Cyrilla racemiflora* L.
*Polygala ramosa* Ell.
" *lutea* L.
*Amorpha herbacea* Walt.
*Aronia arbutifolia* (L.) Pers.
*Sarracenia flava* L.
*Sarracenia minor* Walt.
*Quercus cinerea* Michx.
*Myrica pumila* (Michx.) Small.
*Habenaria blephariglottis* (Willd.) Torr.
*Habenaria cristata* (Michx.) R. Br.
*Gyrotheca tinctoria* (Walt.) Sal.
*Smilax laurifolia* L.
*Lilium Catesbaei* Walt.
*Zygadenus glaberrimus* Michx.
*Tofieldia racemosa* (Walt.) B. S. P.
*Eriocaulon decangulare* L.
*Carex glaucescens* Ell.
*Dichromena latifolia* Baldw.
*Campulosus aromaticus* (Walt.) Trin.
*Aristida stricta* Michx.

No attempt is made to include in this list any plants of dunes and marshes which were seen only at Wrightsville Beach, or any species whose apparently greater abundance in that vicinity was probably due only to the fact that I spent a few hours on the ground in New Hanover County, and nowhere else in North Carolina. The species listed here all grow in dry, intermediate or moist pine-barrens or in branch-swamps, and the reason for their frequency near Wilmington and comparative scarcity a hundred miles away in either direction is as yet obscure, though it is probably connected in some way with the geological peculiarities mentioned above. The fact that the vicinity of Wilmington is a sort

* See also Torreya 7 : 43, where are enumerated a few species apparently confined to this vicinity, none of which I happened to see on this trip.

† I saw this only once, in moist pine-barrens near Wrightsville. In the spring of 1794 Michaux found it near Wilmington, and 65 miles north of there. I have not come across any authentic published record of its occurrence outside of eastern North Carolina.

of distribution center has been noticed before, by Kerr,* Gray,† and perhaps others, but apparently not yet explained.

Another interesting though smaller group of plants includes those seen oftener in Virginia than in North Carolina. These happen to be all trees and shrubs,‡ namely, *Oxydendrum arboreum*, *Aralia spinosa*, *Cornus florida*, *Rhus copallina*, *Quercus alba*, *Q. minor*, *Q. Phellos*, *Fagus americana* and *Pinus echinata*.§ As I traveled 275 miles by rail through North Carolina (or about 295 including trip from Wilmington to Wrightsville Beach and back by electric cars), and only 137 in Virginia by daylight, traversed the whole width of the coastal plain in both states, and tried to note each species as often as possible, it is safe to assume from the returns that all these are at least twice as frequent in southeastern Virginia as in the corresponding parts of North Carolina.

The causes of their greater frequency in Virginia are doubtless somewhat complex, and need not be discussed here. An examination of their general distribution and habitats brings out some interesting points. In the coastal plain of Georgia and Alabama all these species grow on bluffs or in hammocks or bottom-lands, especially outside of the pine-barrens, and they evidently belong to a stage of vegetation much more nearly approaching the climax condition than does that of the pine-barrens.‖ They are all common in the northwestern portion of the coastal plain of Alabama, a region notable for the lack of diversity in its flora and the wide distribution of nearly all the species inhabiting it.¶

Some notes on the commoner species of the region traversed, and their habitats, may be of interest. The following were seen in all three states, and in most of the 25 or 30 counties in which notes were taken:

*Eupatorium rotundifolium* L. (intermediate pine-barrens, etc.).

---

* Rep. Geol. Surv. N. C. **1875**: 106.

† Am. Jour. Sci. III. **28**: 336. 1884.

‡ Probably mostly because herbs are relatively much less abundant and conspicuous (in natural plant-communities) outside of the pine-barrens.

§ For notes on the occurrence of some of these in the vicinity of Dismal Swamp, see Ward, Field and Forest **3**: 30. 1877; Kearney, Contr. U. S. Nat. Herb. **5**: 404, 476–479. 1901.

‖ See Ann. N. Y. Acad. **17**: 103; Plant World **9**: 267. 1906.

¶ See Torreya **7**: 45. 1907; also Mohr, Contr. U. S. Nat. Herb. **6**: 90. 1901.

*Clethra alnifolia* L. (pocosins and bushy pine-barrens).
*Nyssa uniflora* Wang. (creek- and river-swamps).
" *biflora* Walt. (along all streams, and in ponds).
*Acer rubrum* L. (creek-swamps mostly).
*Liquidambar Styraciflua* L. (nearly everywhere, but mostly small and scattered).
*Liriodendron Tulipifera* L. (branch-swamps and other low grounds).
*Magnolia glauca* L. (non-alluvial swamps and pocosins).
*Quercus marylandica* Muench. (dry woods and pine-barrens).
*Alnus rugosa* Koch (along branches mostly).
*Salix nigra* Marsh. (along creeks mostly).
*Pinus Taeda* L. (nearly everywhere).
" *serotina* Michx. (pocosins and other damp sandy places).
*Taxodium distichum* (L.) Rich. (creeks and rivers).

The following were also seen in all three states, but less frequently than those just mentioned:

*Ilex glabra* (L.) Gray (intermediate pine-barrens, etc.).
*Phoradendron flavescens* (Pursh) Nutt. (on *Nyssa biflora*).
*Quercus digitata* (Marsh.) Sudw. (dry woods, etc.).
" *Catesbaei* Michx. (dry pine-barrens and sand-hills).
" *Phellos* L. (low grounds).
*Betula nigra* L. (along creeks and rivers).
*Myrica cerifera* L. (bushy pine-barrens, and low grounds).
*Spartina glabra* Muhl. (salt marshes).
*Pinus echinata* Mill. (sand-hills and dry woods).
*Anchistea virginica* (L.) Presl (damp sandy places).
*Pteridium aquilinum* (L.) Kuhn. (intermediate pine-barrens, etc.).

## NOTEWORTHY SPECIES

The following seem to deserve separate mention.

### SENECIO TOMENTOSUS Michx.

Seen only along the railroad right-of-way, in Bertie, Hertford, and Gates counties, N. C., and Nansemond County, Va., where it was quite common. Mr. Kearney * noted its abundance in the same general region, and it was previously reported from the

* Contr. U. S. Nat. Herb. 5: 408, 472, 547. 1901.

vicinity of Hampton, Va.,* and Elizabeth City, N. C., † by Chickering, and near Weldon, N. C., by Ward; ‡ all these places being within 125 miles of each other. In Georgia it behaves quite differently, being chiefly confined to flat rocks; § and at the time it was described it was known only from Flat Rock, a large granite exposure in Kershaw County, S. C. This, together with the fact that it has not been reported from any natural habitat in the Dismal Swamp region, suggests that it may have been introduced there in comparatively recent times. More information about its distribution is greatly to be desired.

ACANTHOSPERMUM AUSTRALE (L.) Kuntze

A few years ago || I noted the gradual spread of this tropical weed northward along railroads in North Carolina. This time I saw it at several stations (*i. e.*, railroad stations) in the pine-barrens, then in Gates County, and finally across the state line in Nansemond County, Virginia. So it is now to be added to the flora of the Manual region.¶

LIMONIUM NASHII Small.

A plant which looks exactly like this species as I have seen it on the Georgia coast, and does not fit the description of *L. carolinianum*, was seen in considerable quantity just back of the dunes on Wrightsville Beach, N. C. It seemed to be the only *Limonium* there, and is doubtless the "*Statice Limonium?* (Masonborough)" of Curtis's catalogue,** and the *Statice caroliniana* of Wood & McCarthy's Wilmington Flora.†† *L. Nashii* has not been previously reported north of Georgia.

LUDWIGIA MARITIMA Harper, Torreya **4**: 163. *f. 2.* 1904.

I had seen no specimens of this from the Carolinas until I

* Field and Forest **3**: 1. 1877; **3**: 152. 1878.

† Am. Nat. **7**: 523. 1873.

‡ Bot. Gaz. **11**: 38. 1886.

§ See Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. **17**: 42, 43, 134; Torreya **6**: 243, 244. 1906.

|| Torreya **3**: 124. 1903.

¶ It has recently been reported as a waif in Lawrence, Mass., by E. S. Schneider in Rhodora (**9**: 26. 1907), but that of course has no special significance.

** Bost. Jour. Nat. Hist. **1**: 101. 1835. Masonboro is only a couple of miles from Wrightsville Beach.

†† Jour. Elisha Mitchell Sci. Soc. **3**: 109. 1887.

found it in the pine-barrens near Wrightsville, N. C. It was behaving suspiciously like a weed, as it and some of its congeners usually do in Georgia, and it may possibly be a comparatively recent (say within 200 years) mutation * from its nearest relative, *L. virgata* Michx.

SASSAFRAS VARIIFOLIUM (Sal.) Kuntze, Rev. 574. 1891.†

Seen in Florence County, S. C., New Hanover and Wayne counties, N. C., and Prince George County, Va., but always as a weed; and it is altogether probable that it is not native anywhere in the Carolina coastal plain, for its normal habitat seems to be on bluffs, which are very scarce in this region, as noted above.

GORDONIA LASIANTHUS L.

Pinchot & Ashe mention no particular localities in North Carolina for this tree, but I saw some small specimens, in flower, a little north and south of Magnolia ‡ in Duplin County, and perhaps also in New Hanover and Brunswick counties. On March 1, 1794, Michaux noted it near (old) Washington, 38 miles north of Wilmington, which must have been within ten miles of where I saw it. It was also reported from the vicinity of Newbern by Croom, and from near the present city of Washington, in Beaufort County, by McCarthy.§

HIBISCUS MILITARIS Cav.

Seen only in the muddy swamps of two of the rivers of the first class mentioned above, the Santee and Peedee, in Berkeley, Williamsburg and Florence counties, S. C. In Georgia likewise I have seen it only along two rivers of the same class, the Savannah and the Ocmulgee; and in Alabama Dr. Mohr knew it only from the Alabama River and its connections in the coastal plain.‖

ACER SACCHARINUM L. (*A. dasycarpum* Ehrh.)

If I am not mistaken I saw some specimens of this tree on the bank of the Roanoke River in Bertie County, N. C. It does not

* See in this connection Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. 17: 116. 1906.

† See Rusby, Nat. Stand. Dispensatory 1105, 1367. 1905; Henkel, U. S. Dept. Agr. Bur. Pl. Ind. Bull. 89: 62. 1906. Robinson, Rhodora 8: 199. 1906.

‡ Could the name of the place perhaps have some connection with this tree?

§ Bot. Gaz. 10: 385. 1885; 12: 78. 1887.

‖ "Tennessee" in his remarks about this species (Contr. U. S. Nat. Herb. 6: 617) is of course a typographical error for "Tensas."

seem to have been reported from eastern North Carolina before, but there is no known reason why it should not grow there, for in Georgia and Alabama it follows the larger rivers some distance down into the coastal plain.*

CYRILLA RACEMIFLORA L.

Seen a number of times, mostly in pocosins, in Columbus, Brunswick, New Hanover, Pender and Duplin counties, N. C., but nowhere else on this trip. I cannot imagine why I did not see it in South Carolina, for it is common in Georgia; or farther north than Duplin County, for it has been reported from Beaufort County, N. C., by McCarthy,† within a mile of the Virginia line by Michaux (February 23, 1794), and from Virginia by Ward ‡ and Heller. §

EUPHORBIA ERIOGONOIDES Small.

Observed in the outskirts of Florence, S. C., with *E. maculata*, in sand along a railroad track, which is just the usual habitat of both in South Georgia. In fact only two natural stations for *E. eriogonoides* are known, both in the Altamaha Grit region of Georgia.‖ It has not previously been reported northeast of Georgia.

POLYGALA LUTEA L.

This has been mentioned above as one of the plants which is evidently more abundant in southeastern North Carolina than in adjacent territory. I might say further that I noted it thirty-one times (in seven counties) in North Carolina, and once in Virginia, but not once in South Carolina, though it is common enough in the pine-barrens of Georgia.

PLATANUS OCCIDENTALIS L.

The only object in mentioning this common tree here is to place on record something probably not generally known, namely, that in the pine-barrens of the Carolinas it seems to be confined

* See Bull. Torrey Club 32: 147. 1905; and Dr. Mohr's remarks on the same species.

† Bot. Gaz. 10: 384. 1885; 12: 78. 1887.

‡ Bot. Gaz. 11: 38. 1886.

§ Bull. Torrey Club 21: 23. 1894.

‖ See Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. 17: 212. 1906.

to the banks of the muddy rivers, just as in Georgia.* In the Carolinas I saw it only along the Santee, Peedee, and Tar rivers; but in Virginia, where the coastal plain vegetation is further advanced toward the climax stage, it occurs along some smaller streams.

SARRACENIA FLAVA L.

Occurs in moist pine-barrens, sometimes sparingly and sometimes abundantly, in Hampton, Berkeley, Williamsburg and Marion counties, S. C., and Columbus, Brunswick, New Hanover, Pender, Duplin and Edgecombe counties, N. C.; but nowhere in all this territory was it as large or as abundant as it usually is in Georgia. On this trip I did not see it at all in Virginia, though I looked specially for it all through that state. But when reporting it from Dinwiddie County a few years ago † I overlooked the fact that Croom ‡ had long before cited specimens from Southampton County, Va., which is southeast of where I last saw it in 1904, and a little northeast of where I first saw it in 1903.§ There seems to be as yet no record of it within twenty miles of Dismal Swamp.

NYMPHAEA FLUVIATILIS Harper, Bull. Torrey Club **33**: 234. 1906

What looks just like this species was seen in the Santee River in South Carolina and in the Chowan in North Carolina. It was previously known only from Georgia, but there is no apparent reason why it should be confined to that state.

MAGNOLIA GRANDIFLORA L.

Noted only twice in Barnwell County and once in Berkeley County, S. C. Mr. McCarthy ‖ reported it from the vicinity of Washington, N. C., but this is probably an error, unless it refers to cultivated specimens.

MAGNOLIA GLAUCA L.

Common in most of the counties passed through, in all three states, but never growing very large. In low pine-barrens and

* See Bull. Torrey Club **32**: 147. 1905.
† Torreya **4**: 123. 1904.
‡ Ann. Lyc. N. Y. **4**: 103. 1837.
§ See Torreya **3**: 123. 1903.
‖ Bot. Gaz. **10**: 384. 1885.

pocosins, especially in Hampton and Williamsburg counties, S. C., and Columbus, Brunswick, New Hanover, Pender, Duplin, Wayne and Edgecombe counties, N. C., it is represented chiefly by low bushes, often very abundant, just as in many places in the Altamaha Grit region of Georgia.* Arborescent specimens were also seen in non-alluvial swamps in Columbus, Brunswick, Edgecombe and perhaps other counties.

PLANERA AQUATICA (Walt.) Gmel.

Observed only in the swamps of the Santee, Black and Peedee rivers, in Berkeley, Williamsburg, Florence and Marion counties, S. C. (Michaux noted the same species on the Santee River, a little higher up than where I crossed it, on April 20, 1795, and April 10, 1796.) Its habitat is thus much like that of *Platanus occidentalis*, though its distribution is quite different in one respect, for it is very nearly confined to the coastal plain, but not altogether to the largest streams. It is one of those species which seems to center in the Mississippi embayment of the coastal plain, and does not extend as far northeast as Virginia.†

QUERCUS CATESBAEI Michx.

I noted this tree in most of the counties passed through southwest of Goldsboro, N. C., and then did not see it again until I passed the sand-hills of the Blackwater River near Zuni, Isle of Wight County, Virginia (half way between Norfolk and Petersburg), where it seems to be quite abundant, though of small size. As I was traveling about 40 miles an hour at the time, and secured no specimens, some persons may be reluctant to admit it to the flora of the "Manual region" without more evidence. I notice however that Pinchot & Ashe report it from Gates County, N. C. (one of the northern tier of counties), which would lead one to expect it in Virginia, even though their map of its range does not correspond with this statement.

FAGUS AMERICANA Sweet

This common tree was seen only a few times in South Carolina and Virginia, and not at all in North Carolina. This is not

*See Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. 17: 59, 239, 333. 1906. Its dimorphism as to size has also been briefly mentioned by Pinchot & Ashe.

†See Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. 17: 246; Bull. Torrey Club 33: 534. 1906; Torreya 7: 44; Science II. 25: 541. 1907.

surprising, however, considering its distribution in the coastal plain of Georgia.*

POPULUS DELTOIDES Marsh., and HICORIA AQUATICA (Michx. f.) Britton

These were noted only in the swamps of the Santee and Pee-dee rivers, like *Hibiscus militaris*. The *Populus*, like *Platanus*, is not known in the Altamaha Grit region of Georgia at all, while the *Hicoria* has a distribution much like that of *Planera*.

MYRICA CERIFERA L.

This was seen in three counties in South Carolina, four in North Carolina, and three in Virginia, and about three times in each, on the average; while its near relative *M. carolinensis* Mill. was noted only once, in a bog near Wrightsville, New Hanover County, N. C. Mr. Kearney scarcely mentions *M. cerifera* in his botanical survey of the Dismal Swamp region, but he appears to have partly confused the two species, as many others have done. Of the numerous references to *M. carolinensis* in his report, those on pages 370–372, 377, 386, 390, 392, 540 and 545 are doubtless correct, while those on pages 382, 400, 404, 473 and 477 almost certainly pertain to *M. cerifera*. The two species look much alike, but when their habitats are considered there is little danger of confusing them. *M. carolinensis* is distinctly a pioneer plant, growing in rocky pastures and barrens in the glaciated region, on dunes on the Middle Atlantic coast, and in sandy bogs in the coastal plain and lower mountains southward; while *M. cerifera* is much more of a climax plant, normally inhabiting hammocks, bluffs, etc., in the coastal plain from Maryland southward. The two species must have had a very different history. *M. carolinensis* is probably losing ground nearly everywhere, like most pioneer plants,† while *M. cerifera*, like several other species whose ranges extend into the tropics,‡ is doubtless tending to spread in the pine-barrens, if not elsewhere. In Georgia *M. cerifera* espe-

* See Bull. Torrey Club 32: 147. 1905; Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. 17: 106, 330. 1906.

† See Bull. Torrey Club 33: 528. 1906.

‡ Such as *Andropogon tener* and *Pinus Elliottii*. See Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. 17: 301–302, 305–306. 1906.

cially favors those rich spots where the Lafayette formation is absent (in this too it behaves like several other subtropical species);* but away from this main pine-barren center it is not so particular.

The following references to places where the ranges, habitats or morphological characters of these plants are described may be helpful.

M. CERIFERA.

Curtiss, Gard. and For. **1**: 280. 1888.
Sargent, Gard. and For. **7**: 474–476. 1894; Silva N. A. **9**: 87–90. 1896.
Lloyd & Tracy, Bull. Torrey Club **28**: 74 (as *M. Gale*), 91. 1901.
Northrop, Mem. Torrey Club **12**: 32, 91. 1902.
Coker, Torreya **5**: 140–144 (as *M. carolinensis*). 1905.
C. S. Chapman, U. S. Forestry Bull. 56: 8, 10, 12. 1906. ("Wax myrtle.")
A. H. Moore, List of plants collected in Bermuda. 8. 1906.
Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. **17**: 15, 103, 106, 110, 111, 252. 1906.
Max Rothkugel, Forestry Quarterly **5**: 3. 1907. ("Myrtle.")

M. CAROLINENSIS.

Treat, Gard. and For. **1**: 494 (*M. cerifera*). 1888.
Sargent, Gard. and For. **7**: 474, 477. 1894; Silva N. A. **9**: 84. 1896.
Harshberger, Gard. and For. **5**: 45–46. 1892; Proc. Acad. Nat. Sci. Phila. 1900: 643, 646, 649, 653; **1903**: 354; **1904**: 604 (as *M. cerifera*).
Hollick, Bull. N. Y. Bot. Gard. **2**: 394, 395. 1902.
Snow, Bot. Gaz. **34**: 294, 296, 298, 301, 305. 1902 (as *M. cerifera*).
Blankinship, Rhodora **5**: 128 (as *M. cerifera*). 1904.
Chrysler, Rhodora **7**: 123, 125, 127. 1905.
Rhodora **7**: 74. 1905; Bull. Torrey Club **33**: 528. 1906; Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. **17**: 55, 90, 91, 252. 1906; Torreya **6**: 214. 1906.

JUNCUS SCIRPOIDES COMPOSITUS Harper, Bull. Torrey Club **33**: 233. 1906

Unmistakable specimens of this were seen in rather dry pine-barrens near Wrightsville, N. C. This discovery extends its known range eastward about 200 miles, and northward about 150, if the artificial station near Aiken, S. C. (cited in the original description), be disregarded.

JUNCUS BIFLORUS Ell. (See Bull. Torrey Club **33**: 232. 1906)

Found in very nearly the same place as the preceding, which gives an authentic record in North Carolina for this neglected species.

* See Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. **17**: 112, 191, 337.

TILLANDSIA USNEOIDES L.

Common nearly all the way through South Carolina, especially in Colleton and Berkeley counties; but much rarer in North Carolina, where I saw it in only five counties, and only once in each. Last noticed near the Roanoke River in Halifax County.

RYNCHOSPORA SEMIPLUMOSA Gray

In rather dry pine-barrens near Wrightsville, N. C. Not previously reported northeast of Georgia.

PINUS PALUSTRIS Mill.

It seems almost superfluous to add anything to what Mohr, Pinchot and Ashe have already written about this important tree in their well-known bulletins, cited above, but I might say that I observed it in every county passed through in the Carolinas except Charleston, S. C., and Nash, N. C. (I have very few notes, though, from these two counties). It becomes very scattered toward its northern limit, however, and I did not see it in Virginia at all. In fact, I know of no one who has seen it in that state in the last decade or two.*

PINUS ELLIOTTII Engelm.

The range of this in South Carolina is very limited, and I saw it only in Hampton County and near the borders of the adjoining counties of Barnwell and Colleton. It perhaps does not grow within thirty miles of Charleston. Many notes on its occurrence in Hampton and Beaufort counties can be found in Bulletin 43 of the U. S. Bureau of Forestry, under the name of "Cuban pine."

PINUS TAEDA L.

This is undoubtedly at present the commonest tree of the whole region, having been seen nearly every mile of the way, in every county passed through, in all three states. It varies considerably

*Michaux, traveling southward along the fall-line on February 24, 1794, first encountered this tree six miles south of the Virginia-North Carolina boundary and ten from Halifax. But Kerr, in his report on the cotton production of Virginia (Tenth Census U. S. 6: 635–637. 1884), mentions its former occurrence in Nansemond and parts of Isle of Wight, Sussex and Prince George counties. Croom has some interesting notes on this species on pages 47 and 48 of his flora of Newbern and vicinity. See also Kearney, Contr. U. S. Nat. Herb. 5: 398, 406, 449. 1901.

in abundance, being apparently most abundant where *P. palustris* is least so (in Virginia and the upper third and lower tenth of the coastal plain of South Carolina, for instance), and vice versa.

PINUS SEROTINA Michx.

In the Carolina coastal plain this tree is almost as frequent as *P. Taeda*, though generally much less abundant. In a few places, however, particularly around Ashton, in Pender County, N. C., it is almost the only pine in sight over a considerable area. It is much more particular as to habitat than *P. Taeda*, being chiefly confined to pocosins and other sandy bogs, and avoiding the least trace of alluvium.

On this trip I saw a good deal of it in Nansemond County, Virginia, as in 1903,* and a little in Sussex County and perhaps a specimen or two in Chesterfield. In the northern edge of Dismal Swamp, along the N. & W. Ry., a few miles east of Suffolk, are many individuals at least a foot in diameter and forty feet tall.

I did not notice until very recently that Mr. Ashe † mentioned the occurrence of this species in Virginia long before I did, but in such an inconspicuous way that it has been overlooked by nearly every subsequent writer. An interesting problem which still awaits solution is to determine how far north *P. serotina* really extends, and whether it overlaps or intergrades with its nearest relative *P. rigida*.

TAXODIUM IMBRICARIUM (Nutt.) Harper

Noted in six counties in South Carolina (especially in Barnwell, Hampton and Williamsburg), but in only two in North Carolina (Columbus and New Hanover). It is common in places along the car line between Wilmington and the beach, where some specimens fully a foot in diameter and forty or fifty feet tall were observed; so it seems strange that Wood & McCarthy knew it from only one spot in that county. After leaving Wilmington I did not see any more of this tree, strange to say, unless a few specimens in the northern edge of Dismal Swamp, which I did

* See Torreya 3: 122. 1903.

† Bull. N. C. Geol. Surv. 5: 15, 31. 1894. See also Kearney, Contr. U. S. Nat. Herb. 5: 483. 1901.

not get a good look at, should prove to be of this species. Authentic records of it farther north than Wilmington are not wanting, however, for Croom reported it from the vicinity of Newbern, and from Drowning Creek, 32 miles southwest of Fayetteville,* which must be almost exactly where I saw it in 1905. †

CHAMAECYPARIS THYOIDES (L.) B.S.P.

This tree is evidently much more local in distribution than is commonly supposed, for I did not see a single specimen between Tuscaloosa and New York (a distance of 1900 miles by the route I took), though I was in or near its supposed range the whole distance. To determine and explain its exact distribution would be a most interesting problem.‡

SELAGINELLA ACANTHONOTA Underw.

Seems quite abundant on the sand-hills of the Lumber River in the northern corner of Horry County, South Carolina. Not previously reported from that state. Ordinarily one could not be sure of the identity of such a small plant when viewing it from a moving train, but as I had seen it under similar circumstances in Georgia just a week before,§ and its habitat at the new station was the same as it usually is in Georgia, ‖I had very little doubt on that score. Having been discovered in North Carolina ¶ and collected several times in Georgia, there was no reason why this species should not turn up in South Carolina.

COLLEGE POINT, NEW YORK.

---

* Am. Jour. Sci. **28**: 166. 1835.

† See Torreya **6**: 42. 1906.

‡ The following references to notes on its local distribution may be of interest: Torreya **3**: 122. 1903; **6**: 43. 1906; **7**: 43. 1907. Also Croom, Am. Jour. Sci. **26**: 316. 1834.

§ See Torreya **6**: 245. 1906.

‖ See Bull. Torrey Club **32**: 152. *f. 3;* Fern Bull. **13**: 15. 1905; Ann. N. Y. Acad. Sci. **17**: 309. *pl. 28.* 1906.

¶ The type locality is near Wilmington, presumably on the sand-hills of the Cape Fear River. This is undoubtedly the "*Lycopodium rupestre*" of Curtis's flora of Wilmington, and probably the "clusters of moss" mentioned in the soil survey of New Hanover County (p. 19) as a characteristic feature of the sand-hills.

# INDEX TO AMERICAN BOTANICAL LITERATURE

## (1907)

The aim of this Index is to include all current botanical literature written by Americans, published in America, or based upon American material; the word America being used in its broadest sense.

Reviews, and papers which relate exclusively to forestry, agriculture, horticulture, manufactured products of vegetable origin, or laboratory methods are not included, and no attempt is made to index the literature of bacteriology. An occasional exception is made in favor of some paper appearing in an American periodical which is devoted wholly to botany. Reprints are not mentioned unless they differ from the original in some important particular. If users of the Index will call the attention of the editor to errors or omissions their kindness will be appreciated.

This Index is reprinted monthly on cards, and furnished in this form to subscribers, at the rate of one cent for each card. Selections of cards are not permitted; each subscriber must take all cards published during the term of his subscription. Correspondence relating to the card-issue should be addressed to the Treasurer of the Torrey Botanical Club

**Anderson, M. P.** Early European botanists in Japan. Jour. N. Y. Bot. Gard. **8**: 99–110. *f. 15.* [Je] 1907.

**Arthur, J. C.,** *and others.* American code of botanical nomenclature. Bull. Torrey Club **34**: 167–178. 11 Je 1907.

**Atkinson, G. F.** A mushroom parasitic on another mushroom. Plant World **10**: 121–130. *f. 22–24.* Je 1907.

**Autran, E.** Les Tropéolacées argentines et le genre *Magallana* Cav. Anal. Soc. Ci. Arg. **63**: 74–81. *pl.* F 1907.

**Becker, W.** Systematische Bearbeitung der Violen-Sektion *Leptidium* (Ging. pro parte maxima). Beih. Bot. Centralb. **22**[2]: 78–96. *pl. 1.* 1 Je 1907.

**Berger, A.** *Opuntia Gosseliniana* Web. Monats. Kakteenk. **17**: 68–71. 15 My 1907. [Illust.]

Native of Baja California.

**Berry, E. W.** Contributions to the Mesozoic flora of the Atlantic coastal plain — II. North Carolina. Bull. Torrey Club **34**: 185–206. *pl. 11–16.* 11 Je 1907.

New species described in *Myrica*, *Quercus*, *Planera*, *Liriodendron*, and *Pterospermites* (2).

**Blakeslee, A. F.** Heterothallism in bread mold, *Rhizopus nigricans.* Bot. Gaz. **43**: 415–418. 17 Je 1907.

**Blumer, J. C.** Notes on heliotropism of *Sisymbrium canescens.* Plant World **10**: 141, 142. Je 1907.

**Brainerd, E.** The behavior of the seedlings of certain violet hybrids. Science II. **25**: 941–944. 14 Je 1907.

**Broadway, W. E.** A Grenada mountain estate. Gard. Chron. III. **41**: 410. 22 Je 1907.

**Broadway, W. E.** Grenada, W. I. Gard. Chron. III. **41**: 383. 15 Je 1907.

Notes on a few native and introduced species.

**Brotherus, V. F.** *Musci,* in Engler & Prantl, Die nat. Pflanzenfam. $1^3$: 865–960. *f. 635–700.* 1907.

*Lembophyllaceae* (Schluss), *Entodontaceae, Fabroniaceae, Pilotrichaceae, Nematoceae,* und *Hookeriaceae.*

**Brown, S.** A new spruce from the Canadian Rocky Mountains. Torreya **7**: 123–125. 19 Je 1907.

*Picea albertiana* sp. nov., native of Alberta.

**Burlingham, G. S.** Suggestions for the study of the *Lactariae.* Torreya **7**: 118–123. 19 Je 1907.

**Clinton, G. P.** Dry rot fungus, *Merulius lacrymans* (Wulf.) Schum. Rep. Conn. Agric. Exp. Sta. **1906**: 336–341. *pl. 26–28.* My 1907.

**Clinton, G. P.** Notes on fungous diseases, etc., for 1906. Rep. Conn. Agric. Exp. Sta. **1906**: 307–331. *pl. 17–22.* My 1907.

**Clinton, G. P.** Root rot of tobacco, *Thielavia basicola* (B. & Br.) Zopf. Rep. Conn. Agric. Exp. Sta. **1906**: 342–368. *f. 14 + pl. 29–32.* My 1907.

**Cockerell, T. D. A.** A new *Mertensia* from Colorado. Muhlenbergia **3**: 68. 8 Je 1907.

**Cockerell, T. D. A.** A new plant (*Ficus*) from the Fox Hills Cretaceous. Univ. Colo. Stud. **4**: 152, 153. Ap 1907.

Scientific expedition to northeastern Colorado.

**Collins, F. S.** The basis of nomenclature for algae. Rhodora **9**: 77–80. 3 Je 1907.

**Cook, M. T.** The embryology of *Rhytidophyllum.* Bull. Torrey Club **34**: 179–184. *pl. 10.* 11 Je 1907.

**Cook, M. T.** Notes on polyembryony. Torreya **7**: 113–117. *f. 1–3.* 19 Je 1907.

**Cook, O. F.** Transmission inheritance distinct from expression inheritance. Science II. **25**: 911–912. 7 Je 1907.

**Cooke, M. C.** Root-rot fungus. Gard. Chron. III. **41**: 361. *f. 153.* 8 Je 1907.

**Copeland, E. B.** Pteridophyta halconenses: a list of the ferns and fern-allies collected by Elmer D. Merrill on Mount Halcon, Mindoro. Philipp. Jour. Sci. **2**: Bot. 119–151. *pl. 1–4.* Ap 1907.

Includes new species in *Dennstaedtia*, *Diplazium* (4), *Asplenium*, *Plagiogyria*, *Acrosorus*, *Prosaptia*, *Polypodium* (4), *Hymenophyllum*, and *Alsophila*.

**Deichmann, H. & Rosenvinge, L. K.** Bemaerkninger om Isfod og Tangrand ved Grønlands Kyster. Bot. Tidssk. **28**: 171–181. *f. 1–3.* 1907.

**Deichmann, H. & Rosenvinge, L. K.** Note sur la limite supérieure des Fucacées et sur le bord de glace ("Isfod") sur les côtes du Groenland. Bot. Tidssk. **28**: 182–184. 1907.

**DeVries, H.** Plant breeding. Comments on the experiments of Nilsson and Burbank. i–xiii. 1–360. *f. 1–114.* Chicago, 1907.

**Dillingham, F. T.** The staff-tree, *Celastrus scandens*, as a former food supply of starving Indians. Am. Nat. **41**: 391–393. 22 Je 1907.

**Dismier G.** Note sur quelques *Philonotis* de l'Amérique du Nord et de l'Europe. Rev. Bryol. **34**: 50–52. [My] 1907.

**Farr, E. M.** Contributions to a catalogue of the flora of the Canadian Rocky Mountains and the Selkirk Range. Contr. Bot. Lab. Univ. Penn. **3**: 1–88. *map.* Je 1907.

**Ferguson, M. C.** Two embryo-sac mother-cells in *Lilium longiflorum*. Bot. Gaz. **43**: 418, 419. *f. 1.* 17 Je 1907.

**Fernald, M. L.** Diagnoses of new spermatophytes from Mexico. Proc. Am. Acad. Arts & Sci. **43**: 61–68. 26 Je 1907.

New species described in *Carex* (2), *Alnus* (2), *Heliotropium*, *Salvia* (9), *Castilleja*, and *Ruellia*.

**Fernald, M. L., & Eames, A. J.** Preliminary lists of New England plants, — XX. *Sparganiaceae*. Rhodora **9**: 86–90. 3 Je 1907.

Includes *Sparganium lucidum* sp. nov.

**Fitzpatrick, T. J.** A proposed new species of *Lilium*. Iowa Nat. **2**: 30, 31. 14 My 1907.

*L. lanceolatum*, a native of Iowa.

**Fletcher, E. F.** *Alchemilla pratensis* found at Westford, Massachusetts. Rhodora **9**: 92. 3 Je 1907.

**Fobe, F.** Einiges über die Blütenbefruchtung der Kakteen. Monats. Kakteenk. **17**: 75–77. 15 My 1907.

**Fowler, J.** Report on the flora of Canso, Nova Scotia. Further Contrib. Can. Biol. **1902–1905**: 59–70. 1907.

**Freeman, E. M.** The ether freezing microtome, in botanical technique. Science II. **25**: 747–749. 10 My 1907. [Illust.]

**Greenman, J. M.** New species of *Senecio* and *Schoenocaulon* from Mexico. Proc. Am. Acad. Arts & Sci. **43**: 19–21. 26 Je 1907.

Two new species of *Senecio* and three of *Schoenocaulon*.

**Griffiths, D.** Concerning some west American fungi. Bull. Torrey Club **34**: 207–211. 11 Je 1907.

Includes new species in *Sclerospora*, *Ustilago*, *Sorosporium*, *Urocystis*, *Aecidium*, and *Puccinia*.

**Grignan, G. T.** Trois beaux *Salvia*. *Salvia azurea grandiflora*, *S. splendens Boule de feu*, *S. splendens Surprise*. Rev. Hort. **79**: 279–281. *f. 94* + *pl.* 16 Je 1907.

**Harper, R. M.** Competition between two oaks. Plant World **10**: 114–117. *f. 20, 21*. My 1907.

**Harrison, A. K.,** *and others*. Reports on the flora of the Boston district, I. Rhodora **9**: 81–86. 3 Je 1907.

**Harshberger, J. W.** The Mexican cypress. Forest Leaves **11**: 24. Ap 1907. [Illust.]

**Hassler, E.** Plantae paraguarienses novae vel minus cognitae IV. Bull. Herb. Boiss. II. **7**: 445–460. 30 My 1907. [Illust.]

New species in *Lobelia* (2), *Paspalum*, *Panicum*, and *Sida*.

**Hay, G. U.** Observations on weather and plants, 1906. Bull. Nat. Hist. Soc. New Brunswick **5**: 559–561. 1907.

**Hay, G. U.** Report of committee on botany. Bull. Nat. His. Soc. New Brunswick **5**: 563, 564. 1907.

**Haynes, C. C.** Ten lophozias. Bryologist **10**: 9–12. *pl. 2, 3*. 2 Ja 1907.

**Heald, F. D.** Field work in plant pathology. Plant World **10**: 104–109. My 1907.

**Hemsley, W. B.** American rubber plants. Kew Bull. Misc. Inf. **1907**: 153–156. My 1907.

**Hemsley, W. B.** *Eupatorium glandulosum*. Curt. Bot. Mag. IV. **3**: *pl. 8139*. Je 1907.

Native of Mexico.

**Hibbard, R. P.** The influence of tension on the formation of mechanical tissue in plants. Bot. Gaz. **43**: 361–382. 17 Je 1907.

**Holm, T.** The genus *Carex* in north-west America. Beih. Bot. Centralb. **22**$^{2}$: 1–29. 1 Je 1907.

**Holway, E. W. D.** North American *Uredineae*. **1**: 57–80. *f.* + *pl. 24–36*. 10 My 1907.

Includes descriptions of 3 new species of *Puccinia*.

**House, H. D.** New or noteworthy North American *Convolvulaceae*. Bot. Gaz. **43**: 408–414. *f. 1–4*. 17 Je 1907.

Includes 9 new species in *Ipomoea*, natives of Mexico or Central America.

**Hoyt, W. D.** Periodicity in the production of the sexual cells of *Dictyota dichotoma*. Bot. Gaz. **43**: 383–392. 17 Je 1907.

**Jeffrey, E. C. & Chrysler, M. A.** The microgametophyte of the *Podocarpineae*. Am. Nat. **41**: 355–364. *f. 1–5*. 22 Je 1907.

**Jensen, C. A.** Some mutual effects of tree-roots and grasses on soils. Science II. **25**: 871–874. 31 My 1907.

**Judd, C. S.** A mesquite grove in Hawaii. Forestry & Irrig. **13**: 186, 187. Ap 1907.

**Livingston, B. E.** Relative transpiration in cacti. Plant World **10**: 110–114. *f. 19*. My 1907.

**Loew, O.** A correction. Science II. **25**: 940. 14 Je 1907.

**MacDougal, D. T.** Natural hybrids. Plant World **10**: 138, 139. Je 1907.

**MacKay, A. H.** The *Diatomaceae* of Canso Harbour, Nova Scotia. A provisional list. Further Contrib. Can. Biol. **1902–1905**: 55–58. 1907.

**Macloskie, G.** The Patagonian flora. Plant World **10**: 97–103. My 1907.

**Merrill, E. D.** The occurrence of *Antiaris* in the Philippines. Philipp. Jour. Sci. **2**: Bot. 111, 112. Ap 1907.

**Mottet, S.** L'*Hibiscus Moscheutos* et ses variétés. Rev. Hort. **79**: 201–203. *f. 66*. 1 My 1907.

**Murrill, W. A.** Exercises commemorative of the two hundredth anniversary of the birth of Linnaeus. Jour. N. Y. Bot. Gard. **8**: 123–139. *pl. 39* + *f. 16–20*. Je 1907.

Includes description of *Linnaea serpyllifolia* Rydberg sp. nov., a native of Alaska.

**Noter, R. de.** Rusticité de quelques *Crinum*. Rev. Hort. **79**: 265–267. 1 Je 1907.

**Parish, S. B.** Recent additions to the flora of Southern California. Muhlenbergia **3**: 57–62. 8 Je 1907.

**Perrédès, P. É. F.** The botanical characters of some Californian species of *Grindelia*. Wellcome Chem. Res. Lab. **65**: 1–3. *pl. 1, 2*. 1907.

**Phillips, F. J.** Notes on *Robinia neo-mexicana*. Forestry & Irrig. **13**: 89–94. F 1907. [Illust.]

**Poisson, H.** *Saundersia mirabilis.* Rev. Hort. **79**: 233, 234. 16 My 1907.
Native of Brazil.

**Pollock, J. B.** Some physiological variations of plants, and their general significance. Science II. **25**: 881–889. 7 Je 1907.

**Quehl, L.** *Mamillaria phellosperma* Engelm. Monats. Kakteenk. **17**: 67, 68. 15 My 1907.
Native of Arizona and California.

**Queva, C.** Contributions à l'anatomie des Monocotylédonées. II. Les Uvulariées rhizomateuses. Beih. Bot. Centralb. **22**[2]: 30–77. *f. 1–49.* 1 Je 1907.

**Ramaley, F.** Botany — Account of collections made. Univ. Colo. Stud. **4**: 161-165. Ap 1907.
Scientific expedition to northeastern Colorado.

**Rick, J.** *Fungi* austro-americani fasc. V u.VI. Ann. Myc. **5**: 28–31. 30 Mr 1907.
Includes new species in *Puccinia* and *Gibberidea.*

**Robinson, B. L.** New or otherwise noteworthy spermatophytes, chiefly from Mexico. Proc. Am. Acad. Arts & Sci. **43**: 21–48. 26 Je 1907.
New species described in *Tigridia, Schoepfia, Mimosa, Pedilanthus, Bonplandia, Brittonastrum* (3), *Russelia, Stemodia, Piqueria, Stevia* (2), *Eupatorium* (10), *Brickellia, Guardiola, Zinnia, Cymophora* gen. nov. (2), *Perymenium, Coreopsis, Tridax, Pericome, Loxothysanus* gen. nov., *Tagetes, Cacalia* (3), and *Perezia* (2).

**Robinson, B. L.** The scientific name of the osage orange. Rhodora **9**: 91. 3 Je 1907.

**Robinson, B. L. & Bartlett, H. H.** New plants from Guatemala and Mexico, collected chiefly by C. C. Deam. Proc. Am. Acad. Arts & Sci. **43**: 48–60. 26 Je 1907.
New species described in *Polypodium, Paspalum, Fuirena, Myriocarpa, Polygonum, Ruprechtia, Aeschynomene, Mimosa, Tetrapteris, Euphorbia, Acalypha, Clusia, Rinorea, Hybanthus, Ipomoea, Cordia, Russelia, Tetramerium, Isertia,* and *Liabum* (2).

**Robinson, C. B.** The seaweeds of Canso. Being a contribution to the study of eastern Nova Scotia algae. Further Contrib. Can. Biol. **1902–1905**: 71–74. 1907.

**Robinson, C. B.** Some features of the mountain flora of the Philippines. Jour. N. Y. Bot. Gard. **8**: 113–117. [Je] 1907.

**Saccardo, P. A.** Notae mycologicae. Series IX. Ann. Myc. **5**: 177–179. 15 My 1907.
Includes new American species in *Calonectria, Dimerosporium,* and *Tuberculina.*

**Schulz, O. E.** *Erythroxylaceae.* Symb. Antill. **5**: 188–211. 20 My 1907.

Includes descriptions of 6 new species of *Erythroxylum*.

**Shull, G. H.** The significance of latent characters. Science II. **25**: 792–794. 17 My 1907.

**Shull, G. H.** Some latent characters of a white bean. Science II. **25**: 828–832. 24 My 1907.

**Skottsberg, C.** Zur Kenntnis subantarktischen und antarktischen Meeresalgen. I. Phaeophyceen. Wissensch. Ergeb. Schwed. Südpolar-Exped. 1901–1903 **4**[6]: 1–172. *f. 1–187* + *pl. 1–10. map.* 1907.

Includes new species in *Ectocarpus* (2), *Geminocarpus* (gen. nov.), *Myrionema* (2), *Leptonema*, *Elachistea*, *Lessonia*, and a new genus *Utriculidium*, from the Falkland Islands and Tierra del Fuego.

**Small, J. K.** Additions to the tree flora of the United States. Torreya **7**: 123–125. 19 Je 1907.

**Smith, E. H.** The blossom end rot of tomatoes. Tech. Bull. Mass. Agric. Exp. Sta. **3**: 3–19. *f. 1–6.* Ap 1907.

**Sterki, V.** Hibernacula of *Utricularia*. Ohio Nat. **7**: 158. 15 My 1907.

**Sudworth, G. B.** A new California oak (*Quercus Pricei*). Forestry & Irrig. **13**: 157, 158. *f. A.* Mr 1907.

**Sudworth, G. B.** A new tree juniper for New Mexico (*Juniperus megalocarpa*). Forestry & Irrig. **13**: 307–310. *f. 1, 2.* Je 1907.

**Terry, W. A.** Causes of variation in color in some red algae. Rhodora **9**: 90, 91. 3 Je 1907.

**Turner, J. B.** Variation in the corolla of *Linaria vulgaris* Mill. Science II. **25**: 1003, 1004. 28 Je 1907.

**Underwood, L. M.** The progress of our knowledge of the flora of North America. Pop. Sci. Mo. **70**: 497–517. *f. 1–7.* Je 1907.

**Urban, I.** *Compositarum* genera nonnulla. Symb. Antill. **5**: 212–286. 20 My 1907.

Includes new species in *Mikania* (2), *Baccharis*, and *Pectis* (7).

**Urban, I.** Nova genera et species III. Symb. Antill. **5**: 287–352. 20 My 1907.

New species described in *Arundinaria* (2), *Zephyranthes* (2), *Gymnosiphon* (2), *Piper*, (2), *Peperomia* (7), *Pilea* (27), *Boehmeria* (2), *Dendropemon*, *Phoradendrum* (3), *Dendrophthora*, *Coccoloba* (3), *Iresine*, *Portulaca* (4), *Cleome* (3), *Morisonia*, *Alchemilla*, and *Prunus*.

**Urban, I.** *Olacaceae.* Symb. Antill. **5**: 177–187. 20 My 1907.

Includes descriptions of 3 new species of *Schoepfia.*

**Van Tieghem, P.** Supplément aux Ochnacées suivi d'une table alphabétique des genres et espèces qui composent actuellement cette famille. Ann. Sci. Nat. Bot. IX. **5**: 157–192. 1907.

Contains lists of plants belonging to this family from Martinique, Guadeloupe, and French Guiana.

**Vinson, A. E.** The function of invertase in the formation of cane and invert sugar dates. Bot. Gaz. **43**: 393–407. 17 Je 1907.

**Weingart, W.** *Cereus xanthocarpus* K. Schum. Monats. Kakteenk. **17**: 65–67. 15 My 1907.

Native of Paraguay.

**Werckle, C.** Eine interessante *Rhipsalis*-Art aus Costarica. Monats. Kakteenk. **17**: 71, 72. 15 My 1907.

**Williamson, E. B.** A collecting trip north of Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario. Ohio Nat. **7**: 129–148. 15 My 1907.

Contains a list of plants collected at Searchmont and Hayden, New Ontario.

**Wilson, A. D.** Some common weeds and their eradication. Ann. Rep. Agric. Exp. Sta. Univ. Minn. **14**: 195–237. *f. 164–188.* 1907.

**Wright, R. R.** The plankton of eastern Nova Scotia waters. An account of floating organisms upon which young food-fishes mainly subsist. Further Contrib. Can. Biol. **1902–1905**: 1–19. *pl. 1–7.* 1907.